

of councils over the pope; and the inviolable character of the Gallican usages. But the fourth is more particularly remarkable, since it imposes new limits even to the spiritual authority of the pontiff. 'Even in questions of faith, the decision of the pope is not incapable of amendment, so long as it is without the assent of the church.' We see that the temporal power of the kingdom received support from the spiritual authority, which was in its turn upheld by the secular arm. The king is declared free from the interference of the pope's temporal authority, the clergy are exempted from submission to the unlimited exercise of his spiritual power. It was the opinion of contemporaries, that although France might remain within the pale of the Catholic church, it yet stood on the threshold, in readiness for stepping beyond it. The king exalted the propositions above named into a kind of 'Articles of Faith,' a symbolical book. All schools were to be regulated in conformity with these precepts; and no man could attain to a degree, either in the juridical or theological faculties, who did not swear to maintain them. But the pope also was still possessed of a weapon. The authors of this declaration—the members of this assembly—were promoted and preferred by the king before all other candidates for episcopal offices, but Innocent refused to grant them spiritual institution. They might enjoy the revenues of those sees, but ordination they did not receive; nor could they venture to exercise one spiritual act of the episcopate. These complications were still further perplexed by the fact that Louis XIV. at that moment resolved on that relentless extirpation of the Huguenots, but too well known, and to which he proceeded chiefly for the purpose of proving his own perfect orthodoxy. He believed himself to be rendering a great service to the church. It has indeed been also affirmed that Innocent XI. was aware of his purpose and had approved it, but this was not the fact. The Roman court would not now hear of conversions effected by armed apostles. 'It was not of such methods that Christ availed himself: men must be led to the temple, not dragged into it.' New dissensions continually arose. In the year 1687, the French ambassador entered Rome with so imposing a retinue, certain squadrons of cavalry forming part of it, that the right of asylum, which the ambassadors claimed at that time, not only for their palace, but also for the adjacent streets, could by no means have been easily disputed with him, although the popes had solemnly abolished the usage. With an armed force the ambassador braved the pontiff in his own capital. 'They come with horses and chariots,' said Innocent, 'but we will walk in the name of the Lord.' He pronounced the censures of the church on the ambassador; and the church of St. Louis, in which the latter had attended a solemn high mass, was laid under interdict. The king also then proceeded to extreme measures. He appealed to a general council, took possession of Avignon, and caused the nuncio to be shut up in St. Olon: it was even believed that he had formed the design of creating for Harial, archbishop of Paris, who, if he had not suggested these proceedings, had approved them, the appointment of patriarch of France. So far had matters proceeded: the French ambassador in Rome excommunicated; the papal nuncio in France detained by force: thirty-five French

bishops deprived of canonical institution; a territory of the Holy See occupied by the king: it was, in fact, the actual breaking out of schism, yet did Pope Innocent refuse to yield a single step. If we ask to what he trusted for support on this occasion, we perceive that it was not to the effect of the ecclesiastical censures in France, nor to the influence of his apostolic dignity, but rather, and above all, to that universal resistance which had been aroused in Europe against those enterprises of Louis XIV. that were menacing the existence of its liberties. To this general opposition the pope now also attached himself. . . . If the pope had promoted the interests of Protestantism by his policy, the Protestants on their side, by maintaining the balance of Europe against the 'exorbitant Power,' also contributed to compel the latter into compliance with the spiritual claims of the papacy. It is true that when this result ensued, Innocent XI. was no longer in existence; but the first French ambassador who appeared in Rome after his death (10th of August, 1689) renounced the right of asylum: the deportment of the king was altered; he restored Avignon, and entered into negotiations. . . . After the early death of Alexander VIII., the French made all possible efforts to secure the choice of a pontiff disposed to measures of peace and conciliation, a purpose that was indeed effected by the elevation of Antonio Pignatelli, who assumed the tiara with the name of Innocent XII., on the 12th of July, 1691. . . . The negotiations continued for two years. Innocent more than once rejected the formulas proposed to him by the clergy of France, and they were, in fact, compelled at length to declare that all measures discussed and resolved on in the assembly of 1682 should be considered as not having been discussed or resolved on 'casting ourselves at the feet of your holiness, we profess our unspeakable grief for what has been done.' It was not until they had made this unreserved recantation that Innocent accorded them canonical institution. Under these conditions only was peace restored. Louis XIV. wrote to the pope that he retracted his edict relating to the four articles. Thus we perceive that the Roman see once more maintained its prerogatives, even though opposed by the most powerful of monarchs."—L. Ranke, *Hist. of the Popes*, bk. 8, sect. 16 (v. 2).

A. D. 1689.—Election of Alexander VIII.

A. D. 1691.—Election of Innocent XII.

A. D. 1700.—Election of Clement XI.

A. D. 1700-1790.—Effects of the War of the Spanish Succession.—Declining Powers.—The issue of the War of the Spanish Succession "will serve to show us that when the Pope was not, as in his contest with Louis XIV., favoured by political events, he could no longer laugh to scorn the edicts of European potentates. Charles II. of Spain, that wretched specimen of humanity, weak in body, and still weaker in mind, haunted by superstitious terrors which almost unsettled his reason, was now, in the year 1700, about to descend to a premature grave. He was without male issue, and was uncertain to whom he should bequeath the splendid inheritance transmitted to him by his ancestors. The Pope, Innocent XII., who was wholly in the interests of France, urged him to bequeath Spain, with its dependencies, to Philip, Duke of Anjou, the grandson of Louis XIV., who claimed through his grandmother, the eldest sister of Charles. He would thus pre-

vent the execution of the partition treaty concluded between France, England, and Holland, according to which the Archduke Charles . . . was to have Spain, the Indies, and the Netherlands, while France took the Milanese, or the Province of Lorraine. The Archbishop of Toledo seconded the exhortation of the Pope, and so worked on the superstitious terrors of the dying monarch that he signed a will in favour of the Duke of Anjou, which was the cause of lamentation, and mourning, and woe, for twelve years, throughout Europe, from the Vistula to the Atlantic Ocean [see SPAIN: A. D. 1701-1702; and ENGLAND: A. D. 1701-1702]. . . . The Duke of Marlborough's splendid victories of Blenheim and Ramillies . . . placed the Emperor Joseph (1705-11), the brother of the Archduke Charles, in possession of Germany and the Spanish Netherlands [see GERMANY: A. D. 1704; and NETHERLANDS: A. D. 1706-1707]; and the victory of Prince Eugene before Turin made him supreme in the north of Italy and the kingdom of Naples [see ITALY: A. D. 1701-1713]. The Pope, Clement XI., was now reduced to a most humiliating position. Political events had occurred . . . which served to show very plainly that the Pope, without a protector, could not, as in former days, bid defiance to the monarchs of Europe. His undutiful son, the Emperor, compelled him to resign part of his territories as a security for his peaceful demeanour, and to acknowledge the Archduke Charles, the Austrian claimant to the Spanish throne. The peace of Utrecht, concluded in 1713 [see Utrecht: A. D. 1712-1714], which produced the dismemberment of the monarchy, but left Philip in the peaceful occupation of the throne of Spain, did indeed release him from that obligation; but it did not restore him to the 'high and palmy state' which he occupied before he was obliged to submit to the Imperial arms. It inflicted a degradation upon him, for it transferred to other sovereigns, without his consent, his fiefs of Sicily and Sardinia. Now, also, it became manifest that the Pope could no longer assert an indirect sovereignty over the Italian States; for, notwithstanding his opposition, it conferred a large extent of territory on the Duke of Savoy, which has, in our day, been expanded into a kingdom under the sceptre of Victor Emmanuel and his successor. We have a further evidence of the decline of the Papacy in the change in the relative position of the States of Europe as Papal and anti-Papal during the eighteenth century, after the death of Louis XIV. The Papal powers of Spain in the sixteenth century, and of France, Spain, and Austria, in the latter half of the seventeenth century, determined the policy of Europe. . . . On the other hand, England, Prussia, and Russia became, in the eighteenth century, the great leading powers in the world. . . . The Pope, then, no longer stood at the head of those powers which swayed the destinies of Europe. . . . The Papacy, from the death of Louis XIV. till the time of the French Revolution, led a very quiet and obscure life. It had no part in any of the great events which during the eighteenth century were agitating Europe, and gained no spiritual or political victories." — A. R. Pennington, *Epochs of the Papacy*, ch. 10.

A. D. 1713.—The Bull *Unigenitus* and the Christian doctrines it condemned. See PORT ROYAL AND THE JANSKINISTS: A. D. 1702-1715.

A. D. 1721.—Election of Innocent XIII.
 A. D. 1724.—Election of Benedict XIII.
 A. D. 1730.—Election of Clement XII.
 A. D. 1740.—Election of Benedict XIV.
 A. D. 1758.—Election of Clement XIII.
 A. D. 1765-1769.—Defense of the Jesuits, on their expulsion from France, Spain, Parma, Venice, Modena and Bavaria. See JESUITI: A. D. 1761-1769.
 A. D. 1769.—Election of Clement XIV.
 A. D. 1773.—Suppression of the Jesuits. See JESUITI: A. D. 1769-1871.
 A. D. 1775.—Election of Pius VI.
 A. D. 1789-1810.—Founding of the Roman Episcopate in the United States of America.—In 1789, the first episcopal see of the Roman Catholic Church in the United States was founded, at Baltimore, by a bull of Pope Pius VI., which appointed Father John Carroll to be its bishop. In 1810, Bishop Carroll "was raised to the dignity of Archbishop, and four suffragan dioceses were created, with their respective sees at Philadelphia, Boston, New York, and Bardstown, in Kentucky." — J. A. Russell, *The Catholic Church in the U. S. (Hist. of the Third Plenary Council of Baltimore*, pp. 16-18).
 A. D. 1790-1791.—Revolution at Avignon.—Reunion of the Province with France. See FRANCE: A. D. 1790-1791.
 A. D. 1796.—First extortions of Bonaparte from the Pope. See FRANCE: A. D. 1796 (APRIL—OCTOBER).
 A. D. 1797.—Treaty of Tolentino.—Papal territory taken by Bonaparte to add to the Cispadane and Cisalpine Republics. See FRANCE: A. D. 1796-1797 (OCTOBER—APRIL).
 A. D. 1797-1798.—French occupation of Rome.—Formation of the Roman Republic.—Removal of the Pope. See FRANCE: A. D. 1797-1798 (DECEMBER—MAY).
 A. D. 1800.—Election of Pius VII.
 A. D. 1802.—The Concordat with Napoleon.—Its Ultramontane influence. See FRANCE: A. D. 1801-1804.
 A. D. 1804.—Journey of the Pope to Paris for the coronation of Napoleon. See FRANCE: A. D. 1804-1805.
 A. D. 1808-1814.—Conflict of Pius VII. with Napoleon.—French seizure of Rome and the Papal States.—Captivity of the Pope at Savona and Fontainebleau.—The Concordat of 1813 and its retraction.—Napoleon "had long been quarrelling with Pius VII., to make a tool of whom he had imposed the concordat on France. The Pope resisted, as the Emperor might have expected, and, not obtaining the price of his compliance, hindered the latter's plans in every way that he could. He resisted as head of the Church and as temporal sovereign of Rome, refusing to close his dominions either to the English or to Neapolitan refugees of the Bourbon party. Napoleon would not allow the Pope to act as a monarch independent of the Empire, but insisted that he was amenable to the Emperor, as temporal prince, just as his predecessors were amenable to Charlemagne. They could not agree, and Napoleon, losing patience, took military possession of Rome and the Roman State." — H. Martin, *Popular Hist. of France*, since 1789, v. 2, ch. 12. — In February, 1808, "the French troops, who had already taken possession of the whole of Tuscany, in virtue of the resignation forced upon the Queen of Etruria, invaded

the Roman territories, and made themselves masters of the ancient capital of the world. They immediately occupied the castle of St. Angelo, and the gates of the city, and entirely dispossessed the papal troops. Two months afterwards, an imperial decree of Napoleon severed the provinces of Ancona, Urbino, Macerata, and Camerino, which had formed part of the ecclesiastical estates, under the gift of Charlemagne, for nearly a thousand years, and annexed them to the kingdom of Italy. The reason assigned for this spoliation was, 'That the actual sovereign of Rome has constantly declined to declare war against the English, and to coalesce with the Kings of Italy and Naples for the defence of the Italian peninsula. The interests of these two kingdoms, as well as of the armies of Naples and Italy, require that their communications should not be interrupted by a hostile power.'—Sir A. Alison, *Hist. of Europe*, 1789-1815, ch. 51 (v. 11).—'The pope protested in vain against such violence. Napoleon paid no attention. . . . He confiscated the wealth of the cardinals who did not return to the place of their birth. He disarmed nearly all the guards of the Holy Father—the nobles of this guard were imprisoned. Finally, Miollis [the French commander] had Cardinal Gabrielle, pro-Secretary of State, carried off, and put seals upon his papers. On May 17, 1809, a decree was issued by Napoleon, dated from Vienna, proclaiming the union (in his quality of successor to Charlemagne) of the States of the pope with the French Empire, ordaining that the city of Rome should be a free and imperial city; that the pope should continue to have his seat there, and that he should enjoy a revenue of 2,000,000 francs. On June 10, he had this decree promulgated at Rome. On this same June 10, the pope protested against all these spoliations, refused all pensions, and recapitulating all the outrages of which he had cause to complain, issued the famous and imprudent bull of excommunication against the authors, favourers, and executors of the acts of violence against him and the Holy See, but without naming any one. Napoleon was incensed at it, and on the first impulse he wrote to the bishops of France a letter in which he spoke in almost revolutionary terms of him who wished,' said he, 'to make dependent upon a perishable temporal power the eternal interest of consciences, and that of all spiritual affairs.' On the 6th of July, 1809, Pius VII., taken from Rome, after he had been asked if he would renounce the temporal sovereignty of Rome and of the States of the Church, was conducted by General Radet as far as Savone, where he arrived alone, August 10, the cardinals having all been previously transported to Paris. And to complete the spoliation of the pope, Napoleon issued on the 17th of February, 1810, a senatus-consultum which bestowed upon the eldest son of the emperor the title of King of Rome, and even ordained that the emperor should be consecrated a second time at Rome, in the first ten years of his reign. It was while oppressed, captive and deprived of all council, that the pope refused the bulls to all the bishops named by the emperor, and then it was that all the discussions relative to the proper measures to put an end to the vicinity of the churches were commenced. . . . The year 1810, far from bringing any alleviation to the situation of the pope and giving him, ac-

ording to the wishes and prayers of the ecclesiastic commission, a little more liberty, aggravated, on the contrary, this situation, and rendered his captivity harder. In effect, on February 17, 1810, appeared the senatus-consultum pronouncing the union of the Roman States with the French Empire; the independence of the imperial throne of all authority on earth, and annulling the temporal existence of the popes. This senatus-consultum assured a pension to the pope, but it ordained also that the pope should take oath to do nothing in opposition to the four articles of 1802. . . . The pope must have soothed himself, . . . even to rejoicing, that they made the insulting pension they offered him depend upon the taking of such an oath, and it is that which furnished him with a reply so nobly apostolic: that he had no need of this pension, and that he would live on the charity of the faithful. . . . The rigorous treatment to which the Holy Father was subjected at Savone was continued during the winter of 1811-1812, and in the following spring. At this time, it seems there was some fear, on the appearance of an English squadron, that it might carry off the pope; and the emperor gave the order to transfer him to Fontainebleau. This unhappy old man left Savone, June 10, and was forced to travel day and night. He fell quite ill at the hospice of Mont Cenis; but they forced him none the less to continue his journey. They had compelled him to wear such clothes . . . as not to betray who he was on the way they had to follow. They took great care also to conceal his journey from the public, and the secret was so profoundly kept, that on arriving at Fontainebleau, June 19, the concierge, who had not been advised of his arrival, and who had made no preparation, was obliged to receive him in his own lodgings. The Holy Father was a long time before recovering from the fatigue of this painful journey, and from the needlessly rigorous treatment to which they had subjected him. The cardinals not disgraced by Napoleon, who were in Paris, as well as the Archbishop of Tours, the Bishop of Nantes, the Bishop of Evreux, and the Bishop of Tréves, were ordered to go and see the pope. . . . The Russian campaign, marked by so many disasters, was getting to a close. The emperor on his return to Paris, December 18, 1812, still cherished chimerical hopes, and was meditating without doubt, more gigantic projects. Before carrying them out, he wished to take up again the affairs of the Church, either because he repented not having finished with them at Savone, or because he had the fancy to prove that he could do more in a two hours' tête-à-tête with the pope, than had been done by the council, its commissions, and its most able negotiators. He had beforehand, however, taken measures which were to facilitate his personal negotiation. The Holy Father had been surrounded for several months by cardinals and prelates, who, either from conviction or from submission to the emperor, depicted the Church as having arrived at a state of anarchy which put its existence in peril. They repeated incessantly to the pope, that if he did not get reconciled with the emperor and secure the aid of his power to arrest the evil, schism would be inevitable. Finally, the Sovereign pontiff overwhelmed by age, by infirmities, by the anxiety and cares with which his mind was worried,

found himself well prepared for the scene Napoleon had planned to play, and which was to assure him what he believed to be a success. On January 19, 1813, the emperor, accompanied by the Empress Marie Louise, entered the apartment of the Holy Father unexpectedly, rushed to him and embraced him with effusion. Pius VII., surprised and affected, allowed himself to be induced, after a few explanations, to give his approbation to the propositions that were imposed, rather than submitted to him. They were drawn up in eleven articles, which were not yet a compact, but which were to serve as the basis of a new act. On January 24, the emperor and the pope affixed their signatures to this strange paper, which was lacking in the usual diplomatic forms, since they were two sovereigns who had treated directly together. It was said in these articles, that the pope would exercise the pontificate in France, and in Italy;—that his ambassadors and those in authority near him, should enjoy all diplomatic privileges;—that such of his domains which were not disposed of should be free from taxes, and that those which were transferred should be replaced by an income of 2,000,000 francs;—that the pope should nominate, whether in France or in Italy, to episcopal sees which should be subsequently fixed, that the suburban sees should be re-established, and depend on the nomination of the pope, and that the unsold lands of these sees should be restored, that the pope should give bishoprics 'in partibus' to the Roman bishops absent from their diocese by force of circumstances, and that he should serve them a pension equal to their former revenue, until such time as they should be appointed to vacant sees; that the emperor and the pope should agree in opportune time as to the reduction to be made if it took place, in the bishoprics of Tuscany and of the country about Geneva, as well as to the institution of bishoprics in Holland, and in the Hanseatic departments; that the propaganda, the confessional, and the archives should be established in the place of sojourn of the Holy Father, finally, that His Imperial Majesty bestowed his good graces upon the cardinals, bishops, priests, and laymen, who had incurred his displeasure in connection with actual events. . . . The news of the signing of the treaty occasioned great joy among the people, but it appears that that of the pope was of short duration. The sacrifices he had been led to make were hardly consummated, than he experienced bitter grief, this could but be increased in proportion as the exiled and imprisoned cardinals, Consalvi, Pacca, di Pietro, on obtaining their liberty, received also the authorization to repair to Fontainebleau. What passed then between the Holy Father and these cardinals I do not pretend to know; but it must be that Napoleon had been warned by some symptoms of what was about to happen; for, in spite of the agreement he had made with the pope to consider the eleven articles only as preliminaries which were not to be published, he decided nevertheless to make them the object of a message that the arch-chancellor was charged to submit to the senate. This premature publicity given to an act which the pope so strongly regretted having signed must have hastened his retraction which he addressed to the emperor by a brief, on March 24, 1818. . . . This time, the emperor, although greatly irritated by the retracta-

tion, believed it was to his interest not to make any noise about it, and decided to take outwardly no notice of it. He had two decrees published: one of February 19, and the other of March 25, 1818. By the first, the new Concordat of January 25 was declared state law; by the second, he declared it obligatory upon archbishops, bishops, and chapters, and ordered, according to Article IV. of this Concordat that the archbishops should confirm the nominated bishops, and in case of refusal, ordained that they should be summoned before the tribunals. He restricted anew the liberty that had been given momentarily to the Holy Father, and Cardinal di Pietro returned to exile. Thereupon, Napoleon started, soon after, for that campaign of 1813 in Germany, the prelude to that which was to lead to his downfall. The decrees issued 'ab irato' were not executed, and during the vicissitudes of the campaign of 1813, the imperial government attempted several times to renew with the pope negotiations which failed. Matters dragged along thus, and no one could foresee any issue when, on January 23, 1814, it was suddenly learned that the pope had left Fontainebleau that very day, and returned to Rome. . . . Murat, who had abandoned the cause of the emperor, and who . . . had treated with the coalition, was then occupying the States of the Church, and it is evident that Napoleon in his indignation against Murat, preferred to allow the pope to re-enter his States, to seeing them in the hands of his brother-in law. While Pius VII. was en route and the emperor was fighting in Champagne, a decree of March 10, 1814, announced that the pope was taking possession again of the part of his States which formed the departments of Rome and Trasmania. The lion, although vanquished, would not yet let go all the prey he hoped surely to retake. The pope arrived on April 30, at Cesena, on May 12, at Ancona, and made his solemn entry into Rome on May 24, 1814."—Talleyrand, *Memoirs*, pt. 6 (c 2)

ALSO IN: D. Silvagni, *Rome: its Princes, Priests and People*, ch. 35-39 (v 2).—C. Botta, *Italy during the Consulate and Empire of Napoleon*, ch. 5-8.—M. de Bourrienne, *Private Memoirs of Napoleon*, v. 4, ch. 6 and 11-12.—*Selections from the Letters and Despatches of Napoleon*, by Capt. Bingham, v. 2-3.—*Memoirs of Napoleon dictated at St. Helena*, v. 5 (*Hist. Miscellany*, v. 1).—P. Lanfrey, *Hist. of Napoleon*, v. 3, ch. 13 and 16.

A. D. 1814.—*Restoration of the Jesuits*. See *JESUITS*: A. D. 1769-1871.

A. D. 1815.—*Restoration of the Papal States*. See *VIENNA, THE CONGRESS OF*.

A. D. 1823.—*Election of Leo XII.*

A. D. 1829.—*Election of Pius VIII.*

A. D. 1831.—*Election of Gregory XVI.*

A. D. 1831-1832.—*Revolt of the Papal States*, suppressed by Austrian troops. See *ITALY*: A. D. 1830-1832.

A. D. 1846-1849.—*Election of Pius IX.*—His liberal reforms.—*Revolution at Rome*.—The Pope's flight.—His restoration by the French. See *ITALY*: A. D. 1848-1849.

A. D. 1850.—*Restoration of the Roman Episcopate in England*.—The Reformation had deprived the Church of Rome of an official home on English soil. . . . But a few people had remained faithful to the Church of their forefathers, and a handful of priests had bravely the risks

attendant on the discharge of their duties to it. Rome, moreover, succeeded in maintaining some sort of organisation in England. In the first instance her Church was placed under an archpriest. From 1628 to 1688 it was placed under a Vicar Apostolic, that is a Bishop, nominally appointed to some foreign see, with a brief enabling him to discharge episcopal duties in Great Britain. This policy was not very successful. Smith, the second Vicar Apostolic, was banished in 1629, and, though he lived till 1655, never returned to England. The Pope did not venture on appointing a successor to him for thirty years. . . . On the eve of the Revolution [in 1688] he divided England into four Vicariates. This arrangement endured till 1840. In that year Gregory XVI doubled the vicariates, and appointed eight Vicars Apostolic. The Roman Church is a cautious but persistent suitor. She had made a fresh advance, she was awaiting a fresh opportunity. The eight Vicars Apostolic asked the Pope to promote the efficiency of their Church by restoring the hierarchy. The time seemed ripe for the change. . . . The Pope prepared Apostolic letters, distributing the eight vicariates into eight bishoprics. . . . The Revolution, occurring immediately afterwards, gave the Pope other things to think about than the re-establishment of the English hierarchy. For two years nothing more was heard of the conversion of vicariates into bishoprics. But the scheme had not been abandoned, and, in the autumn of 1850, the Pope restored to the Vatican by French bayonets, issued a brief for 're-establishing and extending the Catholic faith in England.' England and Wales were divided into twelve sees. One of them, Westminster, was made into an archbishopric, and Wiseman, an Irishman by extraction, who had been Vicar Apostolic of the London District, and Bishop of Melipotanus, was promoted to it. Shortly afterwards a new distinction was conferred upon him, and the new archbishop was made a cardinal. The publication of the brief created a ferment in England. The effect of the Pope's language was increased by a pastoral from the new archbishop, in which he talked of governing, and continuing to govern, his see with episcopal jurisdiction, and by the declaration of an eminent convert that the people of England, who for so many years have been separated from the see of Rome, are about of their own free will to be added to the Holy Church. For the moment, High Churchmen and Low Churchmen forgot their differences in their eagerness to punish a usurpation of what was called the Queen's prerogative. The Prime Minister, instead of attempting to moderate the tempest, added violence to the storm by denouncing, in a letter to the Bishop of Durham, the late aggression of the Pope as 'insolent and insidious, . . . inconsistent with the Queen's supremacy, with the rights of our bishops and clergy, and with the spiritual independence of the nation.'

. . . Amidst the excitement which was thus occasioned, Parliament met. The Speech from the Throne alluded to the strong feelings excited by 'the recent assumption of ecclesiastical titles conferred by a foreign Power' . . . It declared that a measure would be introduced into Parliament to maintain 'under God's blessing, the religious liberty which is so justly prized by the people.' It hardly required such words as these to fan the spreading flame. In the debate on the Address,

hardly any notice was taken of any subject except the 'triple tyrant's insolent pretension.' On the first Friday in the session, Russell introduced a measure forbidding the assumption of territorial titles by the priests and prelates of the Roman Catholic Church; declaring all gifts made to them, and all acts done by them, under those titles null and void; and forfeiting to the Crown all property bequeathed to them." Action on the Bill was interrupted in the House by a Ministerial crisis, which ended, however, in the return of Lord John Russell and his colleagues to the administration; but the Ecclesiastical Titles Bill, when it was again brought forward, was greatly changed. In its amended shape the bill merely made it illegal for Roman Catholic prelates to assume territorial titles. According to the criticism of one of the Conservatives, "the original bill . . . was milk and water; by some chemical process the Government had extracted all the milk." After much debate the emasculated bill became a law, but it was never put into execution — S. Walpole, *Hist. of Eng. from 1815, ch. 23 (n. 5)*

ALSO IN J. McCarthy, *Hist. of Our Own Times, ch. 20 (n. 2)* — J. Stoughton, *Religion in England, 1800-1850, r. 2, ch. 13*

A. D. 1854.—Promulgation of the Dogma of the Immaculate Conception of the Virgin Mary.—"The thought of defining dogmatically the belief of all ages and all Catholic nations in the Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin dated back to the beginning of his [Pius IX.'s] pontificate. By an encyclical letter dated from his exile at Gaeta, he had asked the opinion of all the patriarchs, primates, archbishops and bishops of the universe as to the seasonableness of this definition. The holding of a general council is attended with many embarrassments, and cannot be freed from the intrigues and intervention of the so called Catholic powers. Pius IX has initiated a new course. All, even the most Gallican in ideas, acknowledge that a definition in matters of faith by the pope, sustained by the episcopate, is infallible. The rapid means of communication and correspondence in modern times, the more direct intercourse of the bishops with Rome, makes it easy now for the pope to hear the well considered, deliberate opinion of a great majority of the bishops throughout the world. In this case the replies of the bishops coming from all parts of the world show that the universal Church, which has one God, one baptism, has also one faith. As to the dogma there was no dissension, a few doubted the expediency of making it an article of faith. These replies determined the Holy Father to proceed to the great act, so long demanded by [the] Catholic heart. . . . A number of bishops were convoked to Rome for the 8th of December, 1854; a still greater number hastened to the Eternal City.

That day the bishops assembled in the Vatican to the number of 170, and robed in white capes and mitres proceeded to the Sixtine Chapel, where the Holy Father soon appeared in their midst." There, after befitting ceremonies, the pontiff made formal proclamation of the dogma of the Immaculate Conception of Mary, in the following words: "By the authority of Jesus Christ our Lord, of the blessed apostles, Peter and Paul, and our own, we declare, pronounce, and define that the doctrine which holds that the Blessed Virgin Mary, at the first instant of her

conception, by a singular privilege and grace of the Omnipotent God, in virtue of the merits of Jesus Christ, the Saviour of mankind, was preserved immaculate from all stain of original sin, has been revealed by God, and therefore should firmly and constantly be believed by all the faithful. Wherefore, if any shall dare—which God avert—to think otherwise than as it has been defined by us, let them know and understand that they are condemned by their own judgment, that they have suffered shipwrecks of the faith, and have revolted from the unity of the Church; and besides, by their own act, they subject themselves to the penalties justly established, if what they think they should dare to signify by word, writing, or any other outward means. The next day the sovereign pontiff assembled the sacred college and the bishops in the great consistorial hall of the Vatican, and pronounced the allocution which, subsequently published by all the bishops, announced to the Catholic world the act of December 8th."—A de Montor, *The Lives and Times of the Roman Pontiffs*, v 2, pp 924-926

A. D. 1860-1861.—First consequences of the Austro-Italian war.—Absorption of Papal States in the new Kingdom of Italy. See ITALY. A. D. 1859-1861.

A. D. 1864.—The Encyclical and the Syllabus.—"On the 8th of December 1864, Pius IX issued his Encyclical [a circular letter addressed by the Pope to all the Patriarchs, Primates, Archbishops and Bishops of the Church throughout the world] 'Quanta cura,' accompanied by the Syllabus, or systematically arranged collection of errors, condemned from time to time, by himself and his predecessors. The Syllabus comprises 80 erroneous propositions. These are set forth under 10 distinct heads viz 1. Pantheism, Naturalism, and Absolute Rationalism; 2. Moderate Rationalism, 3. Indifferentism, Latitudinarianism; 4. Socialism, Communism, Secret Societies, Biblical Societies, Clerico-Liberal Societies, 5. Errors concerning the Church and her rights; 6. Errors concerning Civil Society, as well in itself as in its relations with the Church, 7. Errors concerning Natural and Christian Ethics; 8. Errors concerning Christian marriage, 9. Errors concerning the Civil Princedom of the Roman Pontiff; 10. Errors in relation with Modern Liberalism. Immediately under each error are given the two initial words, and the date, of the particular Papal Allocution, Encyclical, Letter Apostolic, or Epistle, in which it is condemned. Whilst, on the one hand, the publication of the Encyclical and Syllabus was hailed by many as the greatest act of the pontificate of Pius IX., on the other hand, their appearance excited the angry feelings, and intensified the hostility, of the enemies of the Church."—J. N. Murphy, *The Chair of Peter*, ch. 83.

The following is a translation of the text of the Encyclical, followed by that of the Syllabus or Catalogue of Errors:

To our venerable brethren all the Patriarchs, Primates, Archbishops, and Bishops in communion with the Apostolic See, we, Pius IX., Pope, send greeting, and our apostolic blessing: You know, venerable brethren, with what care and what pastoral vigilance the Roman Pontiffs, our predecessors—fulfilling the charge intrusted to them by our Lord Jesus Christ himself in the

person of the blessed Peter, chief of the apostles—have unfailingly observed their duty in providing food for the sheep and the lambs, in assiduously nourishing the flock of the Lord with the words of faith, in imbuing them with salutary doctrine, and in turning them away from poisoned pastures; all this is known to you, and you have appreciated it. And certainly our predecessors, in affirming and in vindicating the august Catholic faith, truth, and justice, were never animated in their care for the salvation of souls by a more earnest desire than that of extinguishing and condemning by their letters and their constitutions all the heresies and errors which, as enemies of our divine faith, of the doctrines of the Catholic Church, of the purity of morals, and of the eternal salvation of man, have frequently excited serious storms, and precipitated civil and Christian society into the most deplorable misfortunes. For this reason our predecessors have opposed themselves with vigorous energy to the criminal enterprise of those wicked men, who, spreading their disturbing opinions like the waves of a raging sea, and promising liberty when they are slaves to corruption, endeavor by their pernicious writings to overturn the foundations of the Christian Catholic religion and of civil society, to destroy all virtue and justice, to deprave all minds and hearts, to turn away simple minds, and especially those of inexperienced youth, from the healthy discipline of morals, to corrupt it miserably, to draw it into the meshes of error, and finally to draw it from the bosom of the Catholic Church. But as you are aware, venerable brethren, we had scarcely been raised to the chair of St Peter above our merits, by the mysterious designs of Divine Providence, than seeing with the most profound grief of our soul the horrible storm excited by evil doctrines, and the very grave and deplorable injury caused specially by so many errors to Christian people, in accordance with the duty of our apostolic ministry, and following in the glorious footsteps of our predecessors, we raised our voice, and by the publication of several encyclicals, consistorial letters, allocutions, and other apostolic letters, we have condemned the principal errors of our sad age, re-animated your utmost episcopal vigilance, warned and exhorted upon various occasions all our dear children in the Catholic Church to repel and absolutely avoid the contagion of so horrible a plague. More especially in our first encyclical of the 9th November, 1846, addressed to you, and in our two allocutions of the 9th December, 1854, and the 9th June, 1862, to the consistories, we condemned the monstrous opinions which particularly predominated in the present day, to the great prejudice of souls and to the detriment of civil society—doctrines which not only attack the Catholic Church, her salutary instruction, and her venerable rights, but also the natural, unalterable law inscribed by God upon the heart of man—that of sound reason. But although we have not hitherto omitted to proscribe and reprove the principal errors of this kind, yet the cause of the Catholic Church, the safety of the souls which have been confided to us, and the well-being of human society itself, absolutely demand that we should again exercise our pastoral solicitude to destroy new opinions which spring out of these same errors as from so many sources. These false and perverse opinions are

the more detestable as they especially tend to shackle and turn aside the salutary force that the Catholic Church, by the example of her Divine author and his order, ought freely to exercise until the end of time, not only with regard to each individual man, but with regard to nations, peoples, and their rulers, and to destroy that agreement and concord between the priesthood and the government which have always existed for the happiness and security of religious and civil society. For as you are well aware, venerable brethren, there are a great number of men in the present day who, applying to civil society the impious and absurd principle of naturalism as it is called, dare to teach that the perfect right of public society and civil progress absolutely require a condition of human society constituted and governed without regard to all considerations of religion, as if it had no existence, or, at least, without making any distinction between true religion and heresy. And, contrary to the teaching of the Holy Scriptures, of the church, and of the fathers, they do not hesitate to affirm that the best condition of society is that in which the power of the laity is not compelled to inflict the penalties of law upon violators of the Catholic religion unless required by considerations of public safety. Actuated by an idea of social government so absolutely false, they do not hesitate further to propagate the erroneous opinion very hurtful to the safety of the Catholic Church and of souls and termed "dehrium" by our predecessor, Gregory XVI, of excellent memory, namely "Liberty of conscience and of worship is the right of every man—a right which ought to be proclaimed and established by law in every well constituted State and that citizens are entitled to make known and declare with a liberty which neither the ecclesiastical nor the civil authority can limit, their convictions of whatever kind, either by word of mouth, or through the press, or by other means." But in making these rash assertions they do not reflect, they do not consider, that they preach the liberty of perdition (St Augustine, Epistle 105, Al 166) and that "if it is always free to human conviction to discuss, men will never be wanting who dare to struggle against the truth and to rely upon the loquacity of human wisdom, when we know by the example of our Lord Jesus Christ how faith and Christian sagacity ought to avoid this culpable vanity" (St. Leon, Epistle 164, Al 133, see 2, Boll Ed.) Since also religion has been banished from civil government, since the doctrine and authority of divine revelation have been repudiated, the idea intimately connected therewith of justice and human right is obscured by darkness and lost sight of, and in place of true justice and legitimate right brute force is substituted, which has permitted some, entirely oblivious of the plainest principles of sound reason, to dare to proclaim "that the will of the people, manifested by what is called public opinion or by other means, constitutes a supreme law superior to all divine and human right, and that accomplished facts in political affairs, by the mere fact of their having been accomplished, have the force of law." But who does not perfectly see and understand that human society, released from the ties of religion and true justice, can have no further object than to amass riches, and can follow no other law in its actions than the indomitable wickedness of a heart given up to

pleasure and interest? For this reason, also, these same men persecute with so relentless a hatred the religious orders, who have deserved so well of religion, civil society, and letters. They loudly declare that the orders have no right to exist, and in so doing make common cause with the falsehoods of the heretics. For, as taught by our predecessor of illustrious memory, Pius VI, "the abolition of religious houses injures the state of public profession, and is contrary to the counsels of the Gospel, injures a mode of life recommended by the church and in conformity with the Apostolic doctrine, does wrong to the celebrated founders whom we venerate upon the altar, and who constituted these societies under the inspiration of God." (Epistle to Cardinal de la Rochefoucauld, March 10, 1791.) In their impiety these same persons pretend that citizens and the church should be deprived of the opportunity of openly "receiving alms from Christian charity," and that the law forbidding "servile labor on account of divine worship" upon certain fixed days should be abrogated, upon the fallacious pretext that this opportunity and this law are contrary to the principles of political economy. Not content with eradicating religion from public society, they desire further to banish it from families and private life. Teaching and professing these most fatal errors of Socialism and Communism, they declare that "domestic society, or the entire family, derives its right of existence solely from civil law, whence it is to be concluded that from civil law descend all the rights of parents over their children, and, above all, the right of instructing and educating them." By such impious opinions and machinations do these false spirits endeavor to eliminate the salutary teaching and influences of the Catholic Church from the instruction and education of youth, and to infect and miserably deprave by their pernicious errors and their vices the pliant minds of youth. All those who endeavor to trouble sacred and public things, to destroy the good order of society, and to annihilate all divine and human rights, have always concentrated their criminal schemes, attention, and efforts upon the manner in which they might above all deprave and delude unthinking youth as we have already shown. It is upon the corruption of youth that they place all their hopes. Thus they never cease to attack the clergy, from whom have descended to us in so authentic manner the most certain records of history, and by whom such desirable benefit has been bestowed in abundance upon Christian and civil society and upon letters. They assail them in every shape, going so far as to say of the clergy in general—"that being the enemies of the useful sciences, of progress, and of civilization, they ought to be deprived of the charge of instructing and educating youth." Others, taking up wicked errors many times condemned, presume with notorious impudence to submit the authority of the church and of this Apostolic See, conferred upon it by God himself, to the judgment of civil authority, and to deny all the rights of this same church and this see with regard to exterior order. They do not blush to affirm that the laws of the church do not bind the conscience if they are not promulgated by the civil power; that the acts and decrees of the Roman Pontiffs concerning religion and the church require the sanction and approbation, or, at least,

the assent, of the civil power; and that the Apostolic constitutions condemning secret societies, whether these exact, or do not exact, an oath of secrecy, and branding with anathema their secretaries and promoters, have no force in those regions of the world where these associations are tolerated by the civil government. It is likewise affirmed that the excommunications launched by the Council of Trent and the Roman Pontiffs against those who invade the possessions of the church and usurp its rights, seek, in confounding the spiritual and temporal powers, to attain solely a terrestrial object, that the church can decide nothing which may bind the consciences of the faithful in a temporal order of things; that the law of the church does not demand that violations of sacred laws should be punished by temporal penalties, and that it is in accordance with sacred theology and the principles of public law to claim for the civil government the property possessed by the churches, the religious orders, and other pious establishments. And they have no shame in avowing openly and publicly the thesis, the principle of heretics from whom emanate so many errors and perverse opinions. They say: "That the ecclesiastical power is not of right divine, distinct and independent from the civil power; and that no distinction, no independence of this kind can be maintained without the church invading and usurping the essential rights of the civil power." Neither can we pass over in silence the audacity of those who, insulting sound doctrines, assert that "the judgments and decrees of the Holy See, whose object is declared to concern the general welfare of the church, its rights, and its discipline, do not claim the acquaintance and obedience under pain of sin and loss of the Catholic profession, if they do not treat of the dogmas of faith and manners." How contrary is this doctrine to the Catholic dogma of the full power divinely given to the sovereign Pontiff by our Lord Jesus Christ, to guide, to supervise, and govern the universal church, no one can fail to see and understand clearly and evidently. Amid so great a diversity of depraved opinions, we, remembering our apostolic duty, and solicitous before all things for our most holy religion, for sound doctrine, for the salvation of the souls confided to us, and for the welfare of human society itself, have considered the moment opportune to raise anew our apostolic voice. And therefore do we condemn and proscribe generally and particularly all the evil opinions and doctrines specially mentioned in this letter, and we wish that they may be held as rebuked, proscribed, and condemned by all the children of the Catholic Church. But you know further, venerable brothers, that in our time insulters of every truth and of all justice, and violent enemies of our religion, have spread abroad other impious doctrines by means of pestilent books, pamphlets, and journals which, distributed over the surface of the earth, deceive the people and wickedly lie. You are not ignorant that in our day men are found who, animated and excited by the spirit of Satan, have arrived at that excess of impiety as not to fear to deny our Lord and Master Jesus Christ, and to attack his divinity with scandalous persistence. We cannot abstain from awarding you well-merited eulogies, venerable brothers, for all the care and zeal with which you have raised your episcopal voice against so great an impiety.

*Catalogue of the Principal Errors of Our Time
Pointed Out in the Consistorial Allocutions, Encyclical and other Apostolical Letters of Pope Pius IX.*

I — PANTHEISM, NATURALISM, AND ABSOLUTE RATIONALISM.

1. There is no divine power, supreme being, wisdom, and providence distinct from the universality of things, and God is none other than the nature of things, and therefore immutable. In effect, God is in man, and in the world, and all things are God, and have the very substance of God. God is, therefore, one and the same thing with the world, and thence mind is confounded with matter, necessity with liberty of action, true with false, good with evil, just with unjust — (See Allocution, "Maxima quidem," June 9, 1862.)

2. All action of God upon man and the world should be denied. — (See Alloc., "Maxima quidem," June 9, 1862.)

3. Human reason, without any regard to God, is the sole arbiter of true and false, good and evil; it is its own law in itself, and suffices by its natural force for the care of the welfare of men and nations — (See Alloc., "Maxima quidem," June 9, 1862.)

4. All the truths of religion are derived from the native strength of human reason, whence reason is the principal rule by which man can and must arrive at the knowledge of all truths of every kind — (See Encyc., "Qui pluribus," Nov. 9, 1846, and "Singulari quidem," March 17, 1856, and Alloc., "Maxima quidem," June 9, 1862.)

5. Divine revelation is imperfect, and therefore subject to the continual and indefinite progress corresponding to the progress of human reason. — (See Encyc., "Qui pluribus," Nov. 9, 1846, and Alloc., "Maxima quidem," June 9, 1862.)

6. Christian faith is in opposition to human reason, and divine revelation is not only useless but even injurious to the perfection of man — (See Encyc., "Qui pluribus," Nov. 9, 1846, and Alloc., "Maxima quidem," June 9, 1862.)

7. The prophecies and miracles told and narrated in the sacred books are the fables of poets, and the mysteries of the Christian faith the sum of philosophical investigations. The books of the two Testaments contain fabulous fictions, and Jesus Christ is himself a myth — (Encyc., "Qui pluribus," Nov. 9, 1846; Alloc., "Maxima quidem," June 9, 1862.)

II. — MODERATE RATIONALISM.

8. As human reason is rendered equal to religion itself, theological matters must be treated as philosophical matters. — (Alloc., "Singulari quidem perfusi.")

9. All the dogmas of the Christian religion are indistinctly the object of natural science or philosophy, and human reason, instructed solely by history, is able by its natural strength and principles to arrive at a comprehension of even the most abstract dogmas from the moment when they have been proposed as objective. — (Letter to Archbishop Friesing, "Gravissimum," Dec. 4, 1862. Letter to the same, "Tuas libenter," Dec. 21, 1862.)

10. As the philosopher is one thing and philosophy is another, it is the right and duty of the

former to submit himself to the authority of which he shall have recognized the truth, but philosophy neither can nor ought to submit to authority—(Letter to Archbishop Frising, "Gravissimus," Dec. 11, 1862, to the same, "Tuas libenter," Dec. 21, 1863.)

11 The church not only ought in no way to concern herself with philosophy, but ought further herself to tolerate the errors of philosophy, leaving to it the care of their correction—(Letter to Archbishop Frising Dec. 11, 1862.)

12. The decrees of the Apostolic See and of the Roman congregation fetter the free progress of science—(Id., ibid.)

13 The methods and principles by which the old scholastic doctors cultivated theology are no longer suitable to the demands of the age and the progress of science—(Id., "Tuas libenter," Dec. 21, 1863.)

14 Philosophy must be studied without taking any account of supernatural revelation—(Id., ibid.)

N B—To the rationalistic system are due in great part the errors of Antony Gunther, condemned in the letter to the Cardinal Archbishop of Cologne, "Eximiam tuam," June 15, 1847, and in that to the Bishop of Breslau, "Dolore haud mediocri," April 30, 1860.

III—INDIFFERENTISM TOLERATION

15 Every man is free to embrace and profess the religion he shall believe true guided by the light of reason—(Apost. Let. "Multiplices inter," June 10, 1851, Alloc., "Maxima quidem," June 9, 1862.)

16 Men who have embraced any religion may find and obtain eternal salvation—(Encyc., "Qui pluribus," Nov. 9, 1846, Alloc., "Ubi primum," Dec. 17, 1847, Encyc., "Singulare quidem," March 17, 1856.)

17 At least the eternal salvation may be hoped for of all who have never been in the true church of Christ—(Alloc., "Singulare quidem," Dec. 9, 1865, Encyc., "Quanto conficiamur in errore," Aug. 17, 1863.)

18 Protestantism is nothing more than another form of the same true religion in which it is possible to be equally pleasing to God, as in the Catholic church—(Encyc., "Nescitis et vobis," Dec. 8, 1849.)

IV—SOCIALISM, COMMUNISM (CLANDESTINE SOCIETIES, BIBLICAL SOCIETIES CLERICO-LIBERAL SOCIETIES

Pests of this description have been frequently rebuked in the severest terms in the Encyc., "Qui pluribus," Nov. 9, 1846, Alloc., "Quibus, quantisque," Aug. 20, 1849, Encyc., "Nescitis et vobis," Dec. 8, 1849, Alloc., "Singulare quidem," Dec. 9, 1854, Encyc., "Quanto conficiamur in errore," Aug. 10, 1863.

V.—ERRORS RESPECTING THE CHURCH AND HER RIGHTS

19. The church is not a true and perfect entirely free association; she does not rest upon the peculiar and perpetual rights conferred upon her by her divine founder, but it appertains to the civil power to define what are the rights and limits within which the church may exercise authority—(Alloc., "Singulare quidem," Dec. 9, 1854; "Multis gravibus," Dec. 17, 1860; "Maxima quidem," June, 1862.)

20. The ecclesiastical power must not exercise its authority without the toleration and assent of the civil government—(Alloc., "Meminit unusquisque," Sept. 30, 1851.)

21. The church has not the power of disputing dogmatically that the religion of the Catholic church is the only true religion—(Lit. Apost., "Multiplices inter," June 10, 1851.)

22. The obligation which binds Catholic masters and writers does not apply to matters proposed for universal belief as articles of faith by the infallible judgment of the church—(Let to Archbishop Frising, "Tuas libenter," Dec. 21, 1863.)

23. The church has not the power of availing herself of force, or any direct or indirect temporal power—(Lit. Apost., "Ad apostolicas," August 22, 1851.)

24. The Roman pontiffs and ecumenical councils have exceeded the limits of their power, have usurped the rights of princes, and have even committed errors in defining matter relating to dogma and morals—(Lit. Apost., "Multiplices inter," June 10, 1851.)

25. In addition to the authority inherent in the episcopate further temporal power is granted to it by the civil power, either expressly or tacitly, but on that account also revocable by the civil power whenever it pleases—(Lit. Apost., "Ad apostolicas," August 22, 1851.)

26. The church has not the natural and legitimate right of acquisition and possession—("Nunquam," December 18, 1856, Encyc., "Incredibili," September 17, 1862.)

27. The ministers of the church and the Roman pontiff ought to be absolutely excluded from all charge and dominion over temporal affairs—(Alloc., "Maximum quidem," June 9, 1862.)

28. Bishops have not the right of promulgating their apostolical letters without the sanction of the government—(Alloc., "Nunquam fore," December 15, 1856.)

29. Spiritual graces granted by the Roman pontiff must be considered null unless they have been requested by the civil government—(Id., ibid.)

30. The immunity of the church and of ecclesiastical persons derives its origin from civil law—(Lit. Apost., "Multiplices inter," June 10, 1851.)

31. Ecclesiastical jurisdiction for temporal lawsuits whether civil or criminal, of the clergy, should be abolished, even without the consent and against the desire of the Holy See—(Alloc., "Acerbissimum," September 27, 1852, Id., "Nunquam fore," December 15, 1856.)

32. The personal immunity exonerating the clergy from military law may be abrogated without violation either of natural right or of equity. This abrogation is called for by civil progress, especially in a society modelled upon principles of liberal government—(Let. to Bishop Montisregal, "Singulare nobilisque," September 29, 1864.)

33. It does not appertain to ecclesiastical jurisdiction, by any right, and inherent to its essence, to direct doctrine in matters of theology.—(Let to Archbishop Frising, "Tuas libenter," Dec. 21, 1863.)

34. The doctrine of those who compare the sovereign pontiff to a free sovereign acting in the universal church is a doctrine which pre-

vailed in the middle ages — (Lit. Apost., Aug. 22, 1851.)

35. There is no obstacle to the sentence of a general council, or the act of all the nation transferring the pontifical sovereign from the bishopric and city of Rome to some other bishopric in another city — (Id., ibid.)

36. The definition of a national council does not admit of subsequent discussion, and the civil power can require that matters shall remain as they are — (Id., ibid.)

37. National churches can be established without, and separated from, the Roman pontiff — (Alloc., "Multis gravibusque," Dec. 17, 1860, "Iamdudum cernimus," March 18, 1861.)

38. Many Roman pontiffs have lent themselves to the division of the church in Eastern and Western churches — (Lit. Apost., "Ad Apostolicas," August 22, 1851.)

VI — ERRORS OF CIVIL SOCIETY, AS MUCH IN THEMSELVES AS CONSIDERED IN THEIR RELATIONS TO THE CHURCH

39. The state of a republic, as being the origin and source of all rights, imposes itself by its rights, which is not circumscribed by any limit — (Alloc., "Maxima quidem," June 9, 1862.)

40. The doctrine of the Catholic church is opposed to the laws and interests of society — (Encyc., "Qui pluribus," Nov. 9, 1846, Alloc., "Quibus quantisque," April 20, 1849.)

41. The civil government, even when exercised by a heretic sovereign, possesses an indirect and negative power over religious affairs — (Lit. Apost., August 22, 1851.)

42. In a legal conflict between the two powers, civil law ought to prevail — (Id., ibid.)

43. The lay power has the authority to destroy, declare, and render null solemn conventions or concordats relating to the use of rights appertaining to ecclesiastical immunity, without the consent of the priesthood, and even against its will — (Alloc., "In consistoriali," Nov. 1, 1850, "Multis gravibusque," Dec. 17, 1860.)

44. The civil authority may interfere in matters regarding religion, morality, and spiritual government, whence it has control over the instructions for the guidance of consciences issued, conformably with their mission, by the pastors of the church. Further, it possesses full power in the matter of administering the divine sacraments and the necessary arrangements for their reception — ("In consistoriali," Nov. 1, 1858, Alloc., "Maxima quidem," June 9, 1862.)

45. The entire direction of public schools in which the youth of Christian States are educated, save an exception in the case of Episcopal seminaries, may and must appertain to the civil power, and belong to it so far that no other authority shall be recognized as having any right to interfere in the discipline of the schools, the arrangement of the studies, the taking of degrees, or the choice and approval of teachers — (Alloc., "In consistoriali," Nov. 1, 1850, "Quibus luctuosissimis," Sept. 5, 1861.)

46. Further, even in clerical seminaries the mode of study must be submitted to the civil authority — (Alloc., "Nunquam fore," Dec. 15, 1856.)

47. The most advantageous conditions of civil society require that popular schools open without distinction to all children of the people, and public establishments destined to teach young

people letters and good discipline, and to impart to them education, should be freed from all ecclesiastical authority and interference, and should be fully subjected to the civil and political power for the teaching of masters and opinions common to the times — (Letter to Archbishop of Friburg, "Quum non sine," July 14, 1864.)

48. This manner of instructing youth, which consists in separating it from the Catholic faith and from the power of the church, and in teaching it above all a knowledge of natural things and the objects of social life, may be perfectly approved by Catholics — (Id., ibid.)

49. The civil power is entitled to prevent ministers of religion and the faithful from communicating freely and mutually with the Roman Pontiff — (Alloc., "Maxima quidem," June 9, 1862.)

50. The lay authority possesses of itself the right of presenting bishops, and may require of them that they take possession of their diocese before having received canonical institution and the Apostolical letter of the Holy See — (Alloc., "Nunquam fore," Dec. 15, 1856.)

51. Further, the lay authority has the right of deposing bishops from their pastoral functions, and is not forced to obey the Roman Pontiff in matters affecting the filling of sees and the institution of bishops — (Lit. Apost., "Multiplices inter," June 10, 1851, Alloc., "Acerbissimum.")

52. The government has a right to alter a period fixed by the church for the accomplishment of the religious duties of both sexes, and may enjoin upon all religious establishments to admit nobody to take solemn vows without permission — (Alloc., "Nunquam fore," Dec. 15, 1856.)

53. Laws respecting the protection, rights, and functions of religious establishments must be abrogated, further, the civil government may lend its assistance to all who desire to quit a religious life, and break their vows. The government may also deprive religious establishments of the right of patronage to collegiate churches and simple benefices, and submit their goods to civil competence and administration — (Alloc., "Acerbissimum," Sept. 27, 1862, "Proba meminoris," Jan. 22, 1885, and "Quum saepe," July 26, 1858.)

54. Kings and princes are not only free from the jurisdiction of the church, but are superior to the church even in litigious questions of jurisdiction — (Lit. Apost., "Multiplices inter," June 10, 1851.)

55. The church must be separated from the State and the State from the church — (Alloc., "Acerbissimum," Sept. 27, 1862.)

VII — ERRORS IN NATURAL AND CHRISTIAN MORALS.

56. Moral laws do not stand in need of the Divine sanction, and there is no necessity that human laws should be conformable to the laws of nature and receive their sanction from God — (Alloc., "Maxima quidem," June 9, 1862.)

57. Knowledge of philosophical and moral things and civil laws may and must be free from Divine and ecclesiastical authority — (Id., ibid.)

58. No other forces are recognized than those which reside in matter, and which, contrary to all discipline and all decency of morals, are summed up in the accumulation and increase of riches by every possible means and in the satisfaction of every pleasure — (Id., ibid.; Alloc.,

"*Maxima quidem;*" Encyc., "Quanto conficiamur," August 10, 1863.)

59. Right consists in material fact. All human duties are vain words, and all human facts have the force of right.—(Alloc., "Maxima quidem," June 9, 1862.)

60. Authority is nothing but the sum of numbers and material force.—(Id., ibid.)

61. The happy injustice of a fact inflicts no injury upon the sanctity of right.—(Alloc., "Jamdudum cernimus," March 18, 1861.)

62. The principle of non-intervention must be proclaimed and observed.—(Alloc., "Novos et ante," Sept. 27, 1860.)

63. It is allowable to withdraw from obedience to legitimate princes and to rise in insurrection against them.—(Encyc., "Qui pluribus," Nov. 9, 1846; Alloc., "Quisque vestrum," Oct. 4, 1847; Encyc., "Noscius et nobiscum," Dec. 8, 1849; Lit. Apost., "Cum Catholica," March 25, 1860.)

64. The violation of a solemn oath, even every guilty and shameful action repugnant to the eternal law, is not only undeserving rebuke, but is even allowable and worthy of the highest praise when done for the love of country.—(Alloc., "Quibus quantisque," April 20, 1849.)

VIII.—ERRORS AS TO CHRISTIAN MARRIAGE

65. It is not admissible, rationally, that Christ has raised marriage to the dignity of a sacrament.—(Lit. Apost., August 22, 1852.)

66. The sacrament of marriage is only an adjunct of the contract, from which it is separable, and the sacrament itself only consists in the nuptial benediction.—(Id., ibid.)

67. By the law of nature the marriage tie is not indissoluble, and in many cases divorce, properly so called, may be pronounced by the civil authority.—(Id., ibid., Alloc., "Acerbissimum," Sept. 27, 1852.)

68. The church has not the power of pronouncing upon the impediments to marriage. This belongs to civil society, which can remove the existing hindrances.—(Lit. Apost., "Multiplices inter," June 10, 1851.)

69. It is only more recently that the church has begun to pronounce upon invalidating obstacles, availing herself, not of her own right, but of a right borrowed from the civil power.—(Lit. Apost., August 22, 1851.)

70. The canons of the Council of Trent, which invoke anathemas against those who deny the church the right of pronouncing upon invalidating obstacles, are not dogmatic, and must be considered as emanating from borrowed power.—(Lit. Apost., ibid.)

71. The form of the said council, under the penalty of nullity, does not bind in cases where the civil law has appointed another form, and desires that this new form is to be used in marriage.—(Id., ibid.)

72. Boniface VIII. is the first who declared that the vow of chastity pronounced at ordination annuls nuptials.—(Id., ibid.)

73. A civil contract may very well, among Christians, take the place of true marriage, and it is false, either that the marriage contract between Christians must always be a sacrament, or that the contract is null if the sacrament does not exist.—(Id., ibid.; Let. to King of Sardinia, Sept. 9, 1868; Alloc., "Acerbissimum," Sept. 27, 1868; "Multiplices inter," Dec. 17, 1860.)

74. Matrimonial or nuptial causes belong by their nature to civil jurisdiction—(Lit. Apost., August 22, 1851; Alloc., "Acerbissimum," Sept. 27, 1852.)

N B.—Two other errors are still current upon the abolition of the celibacy of priests and the preference due to the state of marriage over that of virginity. These have been refuted—the first in Encyc., "Qui pluribus," Nov. 9, 1846; the second in Lit. Apost., "Multiplices inter," June 10, 1851.

IX.—ERRORS REGARDING THE CIVIL POWER OF THE SOVEREIGN PONTIFF.

75. The children of the Christian and Catholic Church are not agreed upon the compatibility of the temporal with the spiritual power.—(Lit. Apost., August 22, 1852.)

76. The cessation of the temporal power, upon which the Apostolic See is based, would contribute to the happiness and liberty of the church.—(Alloc., "Quibus quantisque," April 20, 1849.)

N B.—Besides these errors explicitly pointed out, still more, and those numerous, are rebuked by the certain doctrine which all Catholics are bound to respect touching the civil government of the Sovereign Pontiff. These doctrines are abundantly explained in Allocs., "Quantumque," April 20, 1859, and "Si semper antea," May 20, 1850; Lit. Apost., "Quum Catholica Ecclesia," March 26, 1860; Allocs., "Novos," Sept. 28, 1860, "Jamdudum," March 18, 1861, and "Maxima quidem," June 9, 1862.

X.—ERRORS REFERRING TO MODERN LIBERALISM

77. In the present day it is no longer necessary that the Catholic religion shall be held as the only religion of the State, to the exclusion of all other modes of worship.—(Alloc., "Nemo vestrum," July 26, 1855.)

78. Whence it has been wisely provided by law, in some countries called Catholic, that emigrants shall enjoy the free exercise of their own worship.—(Alloc., "Acerbissimum," Sept. 27, 1852.)

79. But it is false that the civil liberty of every mode of worship and the full power given to all of overtly and publicly displaying their opinions and their thoughts conduce more easily to corrupt the morals and minds of the people and to the propagation of the evil of indifference.—(Alloc., "Nunquam fore," Dec. 15, 1856.)

80. The Roman pontiff can and ought to reconcile himself to and agree with progress, liberalism, and modern civilization.—(Alloc., "Jamdudum cernimus," March 18, 1861.)

A. D. 1869-1870.—The Ecumenical Council of the Vatican.—Adoption and Promulgation of the Dogma of Papal Infallibility.—"More than 300 years after the close of the Council of Trent, Pope Pius IX. . . . resolved to convocate a new ecumenical Council. . . . He first intimated his intention, June 26, 1867, in an Allocution to 500 Bishops who were assembled at the 18th centenary of the martyrdom of St. Peter in Rome. . . . The call was issued by an Encyclical, commencing 'Eterni Patris Unigenitus Filius,' in the 23rd year of his Pontificate, on the feast of St. Peter and Paul, June 29, 1868. It created at once a universal commotion in the Christian world, and called forth a multitude of books and pamphlets even before the Council

convened. . . . It was even hoped that the Council might become a general feast of reconciliation of divided Christendom, and hence the Greek schismatics, and the Protestant heretics and other non-Catholics, were invited by two special letters of the Pope (Sept. 8, and Sept. 18, 1868) to return on this auspicious occasion to 'the only sheepfold of Christ'. . . . But the Eastern Patriarchs spurned the invitation. . . . The Protestant communions either ignored or respectfully declined it. Thus the Vatican Council, like that of Trent, turned out to be simply a general Roman Council, and apparently put the prospect of a reunion of Christendom farther off than ever before. While these sanguine expectations of Pius IX, were doomed to disappointment, the chief object of the Council was attained in spite of the strong opposition of the minority of liberal Catholics. This object . . . was nothing less than the proclamation of the personal Infallibility of the Pope, as a binding article of the Roman Catholic faith for all time to come. Herein lies the whole importance of the Council, all the rest dwindles into insignificance, and could never have justified its convocation. After extensive and careful preparations, the first (and perhaps the last) Vatican Council was solemnly opened amid the sound of innumerable bells and the cannon of St. Angelo, but under frowning skies and a pouring rain, on the festival of the Immaculate Conception of the Virgin Mary, Dec. 8, 1869, in the Basilica of the Vatican. It reached its height at the fourth public session, July 18, 1870, when the decree of Papal Infallibility was proclaimed. After this it dragged on a sickly existence till October 20, 1870, when it was adjourned till Nov. 11, 1870, but indefinitely postponed on account of the extraordinary change in the political situation of Europe. For, on the second of September the French Empire, which had been the main support of the temporal power of the Pope, collapsed with the surrender of Napoleon III, at the old Huguenot stronghold of Sedan, to the Protestant King William of Prussia, and on the 20th of September the Italian troops, in the name of King Victor Emmanuel, took possession of Rome, as the future capital of United Italy. Whether the Council will ever be convened again to complete its vast labors, like the twice interrupted Council of Trent, remains to be seen. But, in proclaiming the personal Infallibility of the Pope, it made all future ecumenical Councils unnecessary for the definition of dogmas and the regulation of discipline. . . . The acts of the Vatican Council, as far as they go, are irrevocable. The attendance was larger than at any of its eighteen predecessors. . . . The whole number of prelates of the Roman Catholic Church, who are entitled to a seat in an ecumenical Council, is 1,037. Of these there were present at the opening of the Council 719, viz., 49 Cardinals, 9 Patriarchs, 4 Princes, 121 Archbishops, 479 Bishops, 57 Abbots and Generals of monastic orders. This number afterwards increased to 764, viz., 49 Cardinals, 10 Patriarchs, 4 Princes, 105 diocesan Archbishops, 22 Archbishops in partibus infidelium, 424 diocesan Bishops, 98 Bishops in partibus, and 52 Abbots, and Generals of monastic orders. Distributed according to continents, 541 of these belonged to Europe, 63 to Asia, 14 to Africa, 113 to America, 12 to Oceanica. At the proclamation of the decree of

Papal Infallibility, July 18, 1870, the number was reduced to 585, and afterwards it dwindled down to 200 or 180. Among the many nations represented, the Italians had a vast majority of 276, of whom 143 belonged to the former Papal States alone. France with a much larger Catholic population, had only 84, Austria and Hungary 48, Spain 41, Great Britain 35, Germany 19, the United States 48, Mexico 10, Switzerland 8, Belgium 6, Holland 4, Portugal 2, Russia 1. The disproportion between the representatives of the different nations and the number of their constituents was overwhelmingly in favor of the Papal influence."—P. Schaff, *Hist. of the Vatican Council* (app. to Gladstone's 'Vatican Decrees' Am. ed.) — The vote taken in the Council on the affirmation of the dogma "showed 400 'placet', 88 'non placet', and 60 'placet juxta modum.' Fifty bishops absented themselves from the congregation, preferring that mode of intimating their dissent. . . . After the votes the Archbishop of Paris proposed that the dissentients should leave Rome in a body, so as not to be present at the public services of the 18th, when the dogma was formally to be promulgated. Cardinal Rauscher, on the other hand, advised that they should all attend, and have the courage to vote 'non placet' in the presence of the Pope. This bold counsel, however, was rejected. . . . The recalcitrant bishops stayed away to the number of 110. The Pope's partisans mustered 533. When the dogmatic constitution 'De Ecclesia Christi' was put in its entirety to the vote, two prelates alone exclaimed 'non placet.' These were Riccio, Bishop of Casazzo, and Fitzgerald, Bishop of Peticola, or Little Rock, in the United States. A violent thunderstorm burst over St. Peter's at the commencement of the proceedings, and lasted till the close. The Pope proclaimed himself infallible amidst its tumult. . . . The Bishops in opposition, after renewing their negative vote in writing, quitted Rome almost to a man. . . . Several of the German bishops who had taken part in the opposition thought that at this juncture it behoved them, for the peace of the Church, and the respect due to the Dogma once declared, to give way at the end of August. They assembled again at Fulda, and pronounced the acceptance of the decree. . . . Seventeen names were appended to the declaration. Among them was not that of Hefele [Bishop of Rottenburg] who, it was soon made known, was determined under no circumstances to submit to the decision of the Council. His chapter and the theological faculty of Tübingen, declared that they would unanimously support him. A meeting of the Catholic professors of theology, held at Nuremberg, also agreed upon a decided protest against the absolute power and personal infallibility of the Pope. The German opposition, evidently, was far from being quelled. And the Austrian opposition, led by Schwarzenberg, Rauscher and Strossmayer, remained unbroken. By the end of August the members of the Council remaining at Rome were reduced to 80. They continued, however, to sit on through that month and the month of September, discussing various 'Schemes' relative to the internal affairs of the Church."—*Annual Register*, 1870, pt. 1, *foreign hist.*, ch. 5.—But on the 20th of October, after the Italian troops had taken possession of Rome, the Pope, by a Bull, suspended the sittings of the Ecumenical Council.

cil. Most of the German bishops who had opposed the dogma of infallibility surrendered to it in the end; but Dr. Döllinger, the Bavarian theologian, held his ground. "He had now become the acknowledged leader of all those who, within the pale of the Romish Church, were disaffected towards the Holy See; but he was to pay for this position of eminence. The Old Catholic movement soon drew upon itself the hostility of the ecclesiastical authorities. On the 19th of April 1871 Dr. Döllinger was formally excommunicated by the Archbishop of Munich, on account of his refusal to retract his opposition to the dogma of infallibility. . . . A paper war of great magnitude followed the excommunication. Most of the doctor's colleagues in his own divinity school, together with not a few canons of his cathedral, a vast number of the Bavarian lower clergy, and nearly all the laity, testified their agreement with him. The young King of Bavaria, moreover, lent the support of his personal sympathies to Dr. Döllinger's movement. . . . A Congress of Old Catholics was held at Munich in September, when an Anti-Infallibility League was formed; and the cause soon afterwards experienced a triumph in the election of Dr. Döllinger to the Rectorship of the University of Munich by a majority of fifty-four votes against six. At Cologne in the following year an Old Catholic Congress assembled, and delegates attended from various foreign States. . . . Dr. Döllinger . . . was always glad to give the Old Catholic body the benefit of his advice, and he presided over the Congress, mainly of Old Catholics, which was held at Bonn in 1874 to promote the reunion of Christendom; but we believe he never formally joined the Communion, and, at the outset, at any rate, he strongly opposed its constitution as a distinct Church. From the day of his excommunication by the Archbishop of Munich he abstained from performing any ecclesiastical function. He always continued a strict observer of the disciplinary rules and commandments of the Roman Catholic Church. . . . The Old Catholic movement did not generally make that headway upon the Continent which its sanguine promoters had hoped speedily to witness, though it was helped in Germany by the passing of a Bill for transferring ecclesiastical property to a committee of the ratepayers and communicants in each parish of the empire. When the third synod of the Old Catholics was held at Bonn in June 1876 it was stated by Dr. von Schulte that there were then 85 communities in Prussia, 44 in Baden, 5 in Hesse, 2 in Birkenfeld, 31 in Bavaria, and 1 in Württemberg. The whole number of persons belonging to the body of Old Catholics was—in Prussia, 17,203; Bavaria, 10,110; Hesse, 1,042; Oldenburg, 249; and Württemberg, 228. The number of Old Catholic priests in Germany was sixty. Subsequently some advance was recorded over these numbers."—*Eminent Persons: Biographies reprinted from the Times*, v. 4, pp. 218-216.

ALSO IN: Quirinus (Dr. J. I. von Döllinger), *Letters from Rome on the Council*.—Janus (the same). *The Pope and the Council*.—J. I. von Döllinger, *Declarations and Letters on the Vatican Decrees*.—H. E. Manning, *The Vatican Council*.—Pomponio Leto (Marchese F. Vitelleschi), *The Vatican Council*.—E. de Pressense, *Rome and Italy at the opening of the Ecumenical Council*.—W. E. Gladstone, *The Vatican Decrees*.

The following is a translation of the text of the Constitution "Pastor aeternus" in which the Dogma of Infallibility was subsequently promulgated by the Pope:

"*Pius Bishop, Servant of the Servants of God, with the approval of the Sacred Council, for an everlasting remembrance.* The eternal Pastor and Bishop of our souls, in order to continue for all time the life-giving work of His Redemption, determined to build up the Holy Church, wherein, as in the House of the living God, all faithful men might be united in the bond of one faith and one charity. Wherefore, before he entered into His glory, He prayed unto the Father, not for the Apostles only, but for those also who through their preaching should come to believe in Him, that all might be one even as He the Son and the Father are one. As then the Apostles whom He had chosen to Himself from the world were sent by Him, not otherwise than He Himself had been sent by the Father; so did He will that there should ever be pastors and teachers in His Church to the end of the world. And in order that the Episcopate also might be one and undivided, and that by means of a closely united priesthood the body of the faithful might be kept secure in the oneness of faith and communion, He set Blessed Peter over the rest of the Apostles, and fixed in him the abiding principle of this twofold unity, and its visible foundation, in the strength of which the everlasting temple should arise, and the Church in the firmness of that faith should lift her majestic front to Heaven. And seeing that the gates of hell with daily increase of hatred are gathering their strength on every side to overthrow the foundation laid, by God's own hand, and so, if that might be, to overthrow the Church: We, therefore, for the preservation, safe-keeping, and increase of the Catholic flock, with the approval of the Sacred Council, do judge it to be necessary to propose to the belief and acceptance of all the faithful, in accordance with the ancient and constant faith of the universal Church, the doctrine touching the institution, perpetuity, and nature of the sacred Apostolic Primacy, in which is found the strength and sureness of the entire Church, and at the same time to inhibit and condemn the contrary errors, so hurtful to the flock of Christ.

CHAPTER I. *Of the institution of the apostolic primacy in Blessed Peter.* We, therefore, teach and declare that, according to the testimony of the Gospel, the primacy of jurisdiction was immediately and directly promised to Blessed Peter the Apostle, and on him conferred by Christ the Lord. For it had been said before to Simon: Thou shalt be called Cephas, and afterwards on occasion of the confession made by him: Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God, it was to Simon alone that the Lord addressed the words: Blessed art thou, Simon Bar-Jona, because flesh and blood hath not revealed it to thee, but my Father who is in Heaven. And I say to thee that thou art Peter; and upon this rock I will build my Church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it. And I will give to thee the keys of the kingdom of Heaven. And whatsoever thou shalt bind upon earth, it shall be bound also in heaven, and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth it shall be loosed also in heaven. And it was upon Simon alone that Jesus after His resurrection bestowed the jurisdiction of Chief Pastor and Ruler over all His fold in the

words: Feed my lambs: feed my sheep. At open variance with this clear doctrine of Holy Scripture as it has been ever understood by the Catholic Church are the perverse opinions of those who, while they distort the form of government established by Christ the Lord in His Church, deny that Peter in his single person, preferably to all the other Apostles, whether taken separately or together, was endowed by Christ with a true and proper primacy of jurisdiction; or of those who assert that the same primacy was not bestowed immediately and directly upon Blessed Peter himself, but upon the Church, and through the Church on Peter as her Minister. If anyone, therefore, shall say that Blessed Peter the Apostle was not appointed the Prince of all the Apostles and the visible Head of the whole Church Militant; or that the same directly and immediately received from the same Our Lord Jesus Christ a Primacy of honour only, and not of true and proper jurisdiction, let him be anathema.

CHAPTER II. *On the perpetuation of the primacy of Peter in the Roman Pontiffs.* That which the Prince of Shepherds and great Shepherd of the sheep Jesus Christ our Lord established in the person of the Blessed Apostle Peter to secure the perpetual welfare and lasting good of the Church, must, by the same institution, necessarily remain unceasingly in the Church; which, being founded upon the Rock, will stand firm to the end of the world. For none can doubt, and it is known to all ages, that the holy and Blessed Peter, the Prince and Chief of the Apostles, the pillar of the faith and foundation of the Catholic Church, who received the keys of the kingdom from Our Lord Jesus Christ, the Saviour and Redeemer of the race of man, continues up to the present time, and ever continues, in his successors the Bishops of the Holy See of Rome, which was founded by Him, and consecrated by His blood, to live and preside and judge. Whence, whosoever succeeds to Peter in this See, does by the institution of Christ Himself obtain the Primacy of Peter over the whole Church. The disposition made by Incarnate Truth therefore remains, and Blessed Peter, abiding through the strength of the Rock in the power that he received, has not abandoned the direction of the Church. Wherefore it has at all times been necessary that every particular Church—that is to say, the faithful throughout the world—should agree with the Roman Church, on account of the greater authority of the principedom which this has received; that all being associated in the unity of that See whence the rights of communion spread to all, as members in the unity of the Head, might combine to form one connected body. If, then, any should deny that it is by the institution of Christ the Lord, or by divine right, that Blessed Peter should have a perpetual line of successors in the Primacy over the Universal Church, or that the Roman Pontiff is the successor of Blessed Peter in this Primacy; let him be anathema.

CHAPTER III. *On the force and character of the Primacy of the Roman Pontiff.* Wherefore, resting on plain testimonies of the Sacred Writings, and in agreement with both the plain and express decrees of our predecessors, the Roman Pontiffs, and of the General Councils, We renew the definition of the Ecumenical Council of Florence, in virtue of which all the faithful of

Christ must believe that the Holy Apostolic See and the Roman Pontiff possesses the Primacy over the whole world, and that the Roman Pontiff is the successor of Blessed Peter, Prince of the Apostles, and is true Vicar of Christ, and Head of the whole Church, and Father and teacher of all Christians; and that full power was given to him in Blessed Peter to rule, feed, and govern the Universal Church by Jesus Christ our Lord: as is also contained in the acts of the General Councils and in the Sacred Canons. Further we teach and declare that by the appointment of our Lord the Roman Church possesses the chief ordinary jurisdiction over all other Churches, and that this power of jurisdiction possessed by the Roman Pontiff being truly episcopal is immediate; which all, both pastors and faithful, both individually and collectively, are bound, by their duty of hierarchical submission and true obedience, to obey, not merely in matters which belong to faith and morals, but also in those that appertain to the discipline and government of the Church throughout the world, so that the Church of Christ may be one flock under one supreme pastor through the preservation of unity both of communion and of profession of the same faith with the Roman Pontiff. This is the teaching of Catholic truth, from which no one can deviate without loss of faith and of salvation. But so far is this power of the Supreme Pontiff from being any prejudice to the ordinary power of episcopal jurisdiction, by which the Bishops who have been set by the Holy Spirit to succeed and hold the place of the Apostles feed and govern, each his own flock, as true Pastors, that this episcopal authority is really asserted, strengthened, and protected by the supreme and universal Pastor; in accordance with the words of S Gregory the Great My honour is the honour of the whole Church. My honour is the firm strength of my Brethren. I am then truly honoured, when due honour is not denied to each of their number. Further, from this supreme power possessed by the Roman Pontiff of governing the Universal Church, it follows that he has the right of free communication with the Pastors of the whole Church, and with their flocks, that these may be taught and directed by him in the way of salvation. Wherefore we condemn and reject the opinions of those who hold that the communication between this supreme Head and the Pastors and their flocks can lawfully be impeded; or who represent this communication as subject to the will of the secular power, so as to maintain that whatever is done by the Apostolic See, or by its authority, cannot have force or value, unless it be confirmed by the assent of the secular power. And since by the divine right of Apostolic primacy, the Roman Pontiff is placed over the Universal Church, we further teach and declare that he is the supreme judge of the faithful, and that in all causes, the decision of which belongs to the Church, recourse may be had to his tribunal: and that none may meddle with the judgment of the Apostolic See, the authority of which is greater than all other, nor can any lawfully depart from its judgment. Wherefore they depart from the right course who assert that it is lawful to appeal from the judgments of the Roman Pontiffs and an Ecumenical Council, as to an authority higher than that of the Roman Pontiff. If then any shall say that the Roman Pontiff has

the office merely of inspection or direction, and not full and supreme power of jurisdiction over the Universal Church, not alone in things which belong to faith and morals, but in those which relate to the discipline and government of the Church spread throughout the world; or who assert that he possesses merely the principal part, and not all the fulness of this supreme power; or that this power which he enjoys is not ordinary and immediate, both over each and all the Churches and over each and all the Pastors and the faithful; let him be anathema.

CHAPTER IV. *Concerning the infallible teaching of the Roman Pontiff.* Moreover that the supreme power of teaching is also included in the Apostolic Primacy, which the Roman Pontiff, as successor of Peter, Prince of the Apostles, enjoys over the whole Church, this Holy See has always held, the perpetual practice of the Church attests, and Ecumenical Councils themselves have declared, especially those in which the East with the West met in the union of faith and charity. For the Fathers of the Fourth Council of Constantinople, following in the footsteps of their predecessors, gave forth this solemn profession: The first condition of salvation is to keep the rule of the true faith. And because the sentence of our Lord Jesus Christ cannot be passed by, who said: Thou art Peter, and upon this Rock I will build my Church, these things which have been said are approved by events, because in the Apostolic See the Catholic Religion and her holy solemn doctrine has always been kept immaculate. Desiring, therefore, not to be in the least degree separated from the faith and doctrine of that See, we hope that we may deserve to be in the one communion, which the Apostolic See preaches, in which is the entire and true solidity of the Christian religion. And, with the approval of the Second Council of Lyons, the Greeks professed that the Holy Roman Church enjoy supreme and full Primacy and preeminence over the whole Catholic Church, which it truly and humbly acknowledges that it has received with the plenitude of power from our Lord Himself in the person of blessed Peter, Prince or Head of the Apostles, whose successor the Roman Pontiff is; and as the Apostolic See is bound before all others to defend the truth of faith, so also if any questions regarding faith shall arise, they must be defined by its judgment. Finally, the Council of Florence defined: That the Roman Pontiff is the true Vicar of Christ, and the Head of the whole Church, and the Father and Teacher of all Christians; and that to him in blessed Peter was delivered by our Lord Jesus Christ the full power of feeding, ruling, and governing the whole Church. To satisfy this pastoral duty our predecessors ever made unwearied efforts that the salutary doctrine of Christ might be propagated among all the nations of the earth, and with equal care watched that it might be preserved sincere and pure where it had been received. Therefore the Bishops of the whole world, now singly, now assembled in synod, following the long-established custom of Churches, and the form of the ancient rule, sent word to this Apostolic See of those dangers which sprang up in matters of faith, that there especially the losses of faith might be repaired where faith cannot feel any defect. And the Roman Pontiffs, according to the exigencies of times and circumstances, sometimes assembling Ecumenical

Councils, or asking for the mind of the Church scattered throughout the world, sometimes by particular Synods, sometimes using other helps which Divine Providence supplied, defined as to be held those things which with the help of God they had recognised as conformable with the Sacred Scriptures and Apostolic Traditions. For the Holy Spirit was not promised to the successors of Peter that under His revelation they might make known new doctrine, but that under His assistance they might scrupulously keep and faithfully expound the revelation or deposit of faith delivered through the Apostles. And, indeed, all the venerable Fathers have embraced, and the holy orthodox Doctors have venerated and followed, their Apostolic doctrine; knowing most fully that this See of holy Peter remains ever free from all blemish of error, according to the divine promise of the Lord our Saviour made to the Prince of His disciples: I have prayed for thee that thy faith fail not, and thou, at length converted, confirm thy brethren. This gift, then, of truth and never-failing faith was conferred by Heaven upon Peter and his successors in this Chair, that they might perform their high office for the salvation of all; that the whole flock of Christ, kept away by them from the poisonous food of error, might be nourished with the pasture of heavenly doctrine; that the occasion of schism being removed the whole Church might be kept one, and, resting on its foundation, might stand firm against the gates of hell. But since in this very age, in which the salutary efficacy of the Apostolic office is even most of all required, not a few are found who take away from its authority. We judge it altogether necessary solemnly to assert the prerogative which the only-begotten Son of God vouchsafed to join with the supreme pastoral office. Therefore We, faithfully adhering to the tradition received from the beginning of the Christian faith, for the glory of God our Saviour, the exaltation of the Roman Catholic Religion, and the salvation of Christian people, with the approbation of the Sacred Council, teach and define that it is a dogma divinely revealed: that the Roman Pontiff, when he speaks ex cathedra, that is, when in discharge of the office of Pastor and Doctor of all Christians, by virtue of his supreme Apostolic authority he defines a doctrine regarding faith or morals to be held by the Universal Church, by the divine assistance promised to him in blessed Peter, enjoys that infallibility with which the divine Redeemer wished that His Church be provided for defining doctrine regarding faith or morals; and that therefore such definitions of the Roman Pontiff are irrefutable of themselves, and not from the consent of the Church. But if anyone—which may God avert—presume to contradict this Our definition; let him be anathema."

A. D. 1870.—End of the Temporal Sovereignty.—Rome made the capital of the Kingdom of Italy.—The Law of the Papal Guarantees.—The events which extinguished the temporal sovereignty of the Pope and made Rome the capital of the Kingdom of Italy will be found narrated under **ITALY: A. D. 1870.**

"The entry of the Italian troops into Rome, and its union to Italy . . . was acquiesced in by all the powers of Europe, both Protestant and Roman Catholic. The French Government of National Defence, which had succeeded to power after the

fall of the Second Empire, expressed through M. Jules Favre, the Minister of Foreign Affairs, its desire that the Italians should do what they liked, and avowed its sympathy with them. . . . The Austro-Hungarian Cabinet was asked by the Papal Court to protest against the occupation of Rome. To this the Imperial and Royal Government gave a direct refusal, alleging among other reasons that 'its excellent relations' with Italy, upon which it had 'cause to congratulate itself ever since reconciliation had been effected' prevented its acceding to the desire of the Vatican. . . . The Spanish Government of the Regency, which succeeded to that of Queen Isabella, adopted much the same line of conduct; it praised Signor Visconti-Venosta's circular, and spoke of the 'wise and prudent' measures it proposed to adopt with regard to the Pope. . . . Baron d'Anethan, at that time Prime Minister of Belgium, who was the leader of the conservative or clerical party in the country, admitted to the Italian Minister at Brussels, 'that speaking strictly, the temporal power was not, in truth, an indispensable necessity to the Holy See for the fulfilment of its mission in the world.' As to the course Belgium would take the Baron said — 'If Italy has a territorial difficulty to discuss with the Holy See, that is a matter with which Belgium has nothing to do, and it would be to disown the principles on which our existence repose if we expressed an opinion one way or the other on the subject.' . . . The Italian Chamber elected in March, 1867, was dissolved, and on the 5th December, 1870, the newly elected Parliament met in Florence for the last time. Among its members now sat those who represented Rome and the province, in which it is situated. The session of 1871 was occupied with the necessary arrangements for the transfer of the capital to Rome, and by the discussion of an act defining the position of the Pope in relation to the kingdom of Italy. The labours of Parliament resulted in the Law of the Papal Guarantees, which, after long and full debate in both Houses, received the royal assent on the 13th of May, 1871. Its provisions ran as follows

Article I.—The person of the Sovereign Pontiff is sacred and inviolable.

Art. II.—An attack (attentato) directed against the person of the Sovereign Pontiff, and any instigation to commit such attack, is punishable by the same penalties as those established in the case of an attack directed against the person of the king, or any instigation to commit such an attack. Offences and public insults committed directly against the person of the Pontiff by discourses, acts, or by the means indicated in the 1st article of the law on the press, are punishable by the penalties established by the 19th article of the same law. These crimes are liable to public action, and are within the jurisdiction of the court of assizes. The discussion of religious subjects is completely free.

Art. III.—The Italian Government renders throughout the territory of the kingdom royal honours to the Sovereign Pontiff, and maintains that pre-eminence of honour recognised as belonging to him by Catholic princes. The Sovereign Pontiff has power to keep up the usual number of guards attached to his person, and to the custody of the palaces, without prejudice to the obligations and duties resulting to such guards from the actual laws of the kingdom.

Art. IV.—The endowment of 8,225,000 francs (lire italiane) of yearly rental is retained in favour of the Holy See. With this sum, which is equal to that inscribed in the Roman balance-sheet under the title, 'Sacred Apostolic Palaces, Sacred College, Ecclesiastical Congregations, Secretary of State, and Foreign Diplomatic Office,' it is intended to provide for the maintenance of the Sovereign Pontiff, and for the various ecclesiastical wants of the Holy See for ordinary and extraordinary maintenance, and for the keeping of the apostolic palaces and their dependencies; for the pay, gratifications, and pensions of the guards of whom mention is made in the preceding article, and for those attached to the Pontifical Court, and for eventual expenses; also for the ordinary maintenance and care of the annexed museums and library, and for the pay, stipends, and pensions of those employed for that purpose. The endowment mentioned above shall be inscribed in the Great Book of the public debt, in form of perpetual and inalienable revenue, in the name of the Holy See, and during the time that the See is vacant, it shall continue to be paid, in order to meet all the needs of the Roman Church during that interval of time. The endowment shall remain exempt from any species of government, communal, or provincial tax, and it cannot be diminished in future, even in the case of the Italian Government resolving ultimately itself to assume the expenses of the museums and library.

Art. V.—The Sovereign Pontiff, besides the endowment established in the preceding article, will continue to have the use of the apostolic palaces of the Vatican and Lateran with all the edifices, gardens, and grounds annexed to and dependent on them, as well as the Villa of Castel Gondolfo with all its belongings and dependencies. The said palaces, villa, and annexes, like the museums, the library, and the art and archaeological collections there existing, are inalienable, are exempt from every tax or impost, and from all expropriation on the ground of public utility.

Art. VI.—During the time in which the Holy See is vacant, no judiciary or political authority shall be able for any reason whatever to place any impediment or limit to the personal liberty of the cardinals. The Government provides that the meetings of the Conclave and of the Ecumenical Councils shall not be disturbed by any external violence.

Art. VII.—No official of the public authority, nor agent of the public forces, ~~can~~ in the exercise of his peculiar office enter into the palaces or localities of habitual residence or temporary stay of the Sovereign Pontiff, or in those in which are assembled a Conclave or Ecumenical Council, unless authorised by the Sovereign Pontiff, by the Conclave, or by the Council.

Art. VIII.—It is forbidden to proceed with visits, perquisitions, or seizures of papers, documents, books, or registers in the offices and pontifical congregations invested with purely spiritual functions.

Art. IX.—The Sovereign Pontiff is completely free to fulfil all the functions of his spiritual ministry, and to have affixed to the doors of the basilicas and churches of Rome all the acts of the said ministry.

Art. X.—The ecclesiastics who, by reason of their office, participate in Rome in the sending

forth of the acts of the spiritual ministry of the Holy See, are not subject on account of those acts to any molestation, investigation, or act of magistracy, on the part of the public authorities. Every stranger invested with ecclesiastical office in Rome enjoys the personal guarantees belonging to Italian citizens in virtue of the laws of the kingdom.

Art. XI.—The envoys of foreign governments to the Holy See enjoy in the kingdom all the prerogatives and immunities which belong to diplomatic agents, according to international right. To offences against them are extended the penalties inflicted for offences against the envoys of foreign powers accredited to the Italian Government. To the envoys of the Holy See to foreign Governments are assured throughout the territory of the kingdom the accustomed prerogatives and immunities, according to the same (international) right, in going to and from the place of their mission.

Art. XII.—The Supreme Pontiff corresponds freely with the Episcopate and with all the Catholic world without any interference whatever on the part of the Italian Government. To such end he has the faculty of establishing in the Vatican, or any other of his residences, postal and telegraphic offices worked by clerks of his own appointment. The Pontifical post office will be able to correspond directly, by means of sealed packets, with the post offices of foreign administrations, or remit its own correspondence to the Italian post offices. In both cases the transport of despatches or correspondence furnished with the official Pontifical stamp will be exempt from every tax or expense as regards Italian territory. The couriers sent out in the name of the Supreme Pontiff are placed on the same footing in the kingdom, as the cabinet couriers or those of foreign government. The Pontifical telegraphic office will be placed in communication with the network of telegraphic lines of the kingdom, at the expense of the State. Telegrams transmitted by the said office with the authorised designation of 'Pontifical' will be received and transmitted with the privileges established for telegrams of State, and with the exemption in the kingdom from every tax. The same advantages will be enjoyed by the telegrams of the Sovereign Pontiff or those which, signed by his order and furnished with the stamp of the Holy See, shall be presented to any telegraphic office in the kingdom. Telegrams directed to the Sovereign Pontiff shall be exempt from charges upon those who send them.

Art. XIII.—In the city of Rome and in the six suburban sees the seminaries, academies, colleges, and other Catholic institutions founded for the education and culture of ecclesiastics, shall continue to depend only on the Holy See, without any interference of the scholastic authorities of the kingdom.

Art. XIV.—Every special restriction of the exercise of the right of meeting on the part of the members of the Catholic clergy is abolished.

Art. XV.—The Government renounces its right of apostolic legateship (*legatio apostolica*) in Sicily, and also its right, throughout the kingdom, of nomination or presentation in the collation of the greater benefices. The bishops shall not be required to make oath of allegiance to the king. The greater and lesser benefices cannot be conferred except on citizens of the kingdom,

save in the case of the city of Rome, and of the suburban sees. No innovation is made touching the presentation to benefices under royal patronage.

Art. XVI.—The royal 'exequatur' and 'placet,' and every other form of Government assent for the publication and execution of acts of ecclesiastical authority, are abolished. However, until such time as may be otherwise provided in the special law of which Art. XVIII speaks, the acts of these (ecclesiastical) authorities which concern the destination of ecclesiastical property and the provisions of the major and minor benefices, excepting those of the city of Rome and the suburban sees, remain subject to the royal 'exequatur' and 'placet.' The enactments of the civil law with regard to the creation and to the modes of existence of ecclesiastical institutions and of their property remain unaltered.

Art. XVII.—In matters spiritual and of spiritual discipline, no appeal is admitted against acts of the ecclesiastical authorities, nor is any aid on the part of the civil authority recognised as due to such acts, nor is it accorded to them. The recognising of the judicial effects, in these as in every other act of these (ecclesiastical) authorities, rests with the civil jurisdiction. However, such acts are without effect if contrary to the laws of the State, or to public order, or if damaging to private rights, and are subjected to the penal laws if they constitute a crime.

Art. XVIII.—An ulterior law will provide for the reorganisation, the preservation, and the administration of the ecclesiastical property of the kingdom.

Art. XIX.—As regards all matters which form part of the present law, everything now existing, in so far as it may be contrary to this law, ceases to have effect.

The object of this law was to carry out still further than had yet been done the principle of a 'free Church in a free State,' by giving the Church unfettered power in all spiritual matters, while placing all temporal power in the hands of the State. The Pope and his advisers simply protested against all that was done. Pius IX. shut himself up in the Vatican and declared himself a prisoner. In the meanwhile the practical transfer of the capital from Florence was effected"—J. W. Probyn, *Italy, 1815 to 1878*, ch. 11.—The attitude towards the Italian Government assumed by the Papal Court in 1870, and since maintained, is indicated by the following, quoted from a work written in sympathy with it. "Pius IX. had refused to treat with or in any way recognize the new masters of Rome. The Law of Guarantees adopted by the Italian Parliament granted him a revenue in compensation for the broad territories of which he had been despoiled. He refused to touch a single lira of it, and preferred to rely upon the generosity of his children in every land, rather than to become the pensioner of those who had stripped him of his civil sovereignty. His last years were spent within the boundaries of the Vatican palace. He could not have ventured to appear publicly in the city without exposing himself to the insults of the mob on the one hand, or on the other calling forth demonstrations of loyalty, which would have been made the pretext for stern military repression. Nor could he have accepted in the streets of Rome the protection of

the agents of that very power against whose presence in the city he had never ceased to protest. Thus it was that Pius IX. became, practically, a prisoner in his own palace of the Vatican. He had not long to wait for evidence of the utter hollowness of the so-called Law of Guarantees. The extension to Rome of the law suppressing the religious orders, the seizure of the Roman College, the project for the expropriation of the property of the Propaganda itself were so many proofs of the spirit in which the new rulers of Rome interpreted their pledges, that the change of government should not in any way prejudice the Church or the Holy See in its administration of the Church. . . . The very misfortunes and difficulties of the Holy See drew closer the bonds that united the Catholic world to its centre. The Vatican became a centre of pilgrimage to an extent that it had never been before in all its long history, and this movement begun under Pius IX. has continued and gathered strength under Leo XIII., until at length it has provoked the actively hostile opposition of the intruded government. Twice during his last years Pius IX. found himself the centre of a world-wide demonstration of loyalty and affection, first on June 16th, 1871, when he celebrated the twenty-fifth anniversary of his coronation, the first of all the Popes who had ever reigned beyond the 'years of Peter,' and again on June 3rd, 1877, when, surrounded by the bishops and pilgrims of all nations, he kept the jubilee of his episcopal consecration. . . . Pius IX. was destined to outlive Victor Emmanuel, as he had outlived Napoleon III. . . . Victor Emmanuel died on January 9th, Pius IX. on February 6th [1879]. . . . It had been the hope of the Revolution that, however stubbornly Pius IX. might refuse truce or compromise with the new order of things, his successor would prove to be a man of more yielding disposition. The death of the Pope had occurred somewhat unexpectedly. Though he had been ill in the autumn of 1877, at the New Year he seemed to have recovered, and there was every expectation that his life would be prolonged for at least some months. The news of his death came at a moment when the Italian Government was fully occupied with the changes that followed the accession of a new king, and when the diplomats of Europe were more interested in the settlement of the conditions of peace between France and Germany than in schemes for influencing the conclave. Before the enemies of the Church had time to concert any hostile plans of action, the cardinals had assembled at the Vatican and had chosen as Supreme Pontiff, Cardinal Pecci, the Archbishop of Perugia. He assumed the name of Leo XIII., a name now honoured not only within the Catholic Church, but throughout the whole civilized world. . . . The first public utterances of the new Pope shattered the hopes of the usurpers. He had taken up the standard of the Church's rights from the hands of his predecessor, and he showed himself as uncompromising as ever Pius IX. had been on the question of the independence of the Holy See, and its effective guarantee in the Civil Sovereignty of the Supreme Pontiff. The hope that the Roman Question would be solved by a surrender on the part of Leo XIII. of all that Pius IX. had contended for has been long since abandoned."—Chevalier O'Clery, *The Making of Italy*, ch. 26.

A. D. 1870-1874.—First Stages of the "Kulturkampf" in Germany.—The May Laws.—Speeches of Bismarck.—"For reasons relating to its own internal affairs the state, even though it took no special attitude to the dogma of infallibility in itself, could not avoid being drawn into the conflicts which that dogma was bound to call forth between its upholders and its opponents. . . . It was necessary for it to interfere and, by introducing civil marriages, to render marriage possible to those apostates who were not allowed to receive the sacraments; it was necessary for it to protect in the exercise of their office those of its public teachers who rejected the new dogma, even if their spiritual superiors should declare them unfit to hold such office. In cases, finally, where whole congregations, or majorities of them, remained true to the old teachings it was necessary for the state to protect them in the possession of their churches of which the bishops tried to deprive them. . . . The chancellor of the empire had now [1871] personally entered the lists. As his cool attitude already before the council had given reason to expect, the Vatican dogma did not much trouble him. All the more alarming seemed to him the agitation which the clergy were stirring up among the Polish nobles. He [Bismarck] caused the announcement to be made in an article of the *Kreuzzeitung* that the government would not only continue on the defensive against the Centre, but in turn would proceed to attack it. The ultramontanes had better consider whether such a struggle could turn out to the advantage of the Roman Church. If, he concluded, three hundred years ago Teutonism in Germany was stronger than Romanism, how much stronger would it be now when Rome is no longer the capital of the world, but on the point of becoming the capital of Italy, and when the German imperial crown no longer rests on the head of a Spaniard but of a German prince. . . . In the Federal Council Lutz moved an amendment to the criminal code which should threaten any clergyman with imprisonment up to two years if he should misuse his office and discuss state affairs so as to disturb the peace. . . . This 'pulpit paragraph' was accepted with 179 to 108 votes and became law December 14th, 1871. . . . The Prussian diet was opened on November 27, 1871, with the announcement of four new laws which should regulate marriages, the registration of civil personal matters, the withdrawal from existing churches, and the supervision of schools. . . . The conservative party was in wild excitement over these measures and the *Kreuzzeitung* became the organ of decided opposition, especially against the school-supervision law which was chosen as the first object of attack. The conservatives collected petitions from all parts of the land to kill this law which they prophesied would make the schools a tool of atheism, a hotbed of revolution, unnationality and immorality. They succeeded in getting together more than 300,000 signatures. . . . At the first reading in the House of Deputies the school-supervision law was passed, although by a majority of only 25 votes. . . . At the second reading the majority increased to 52. . . . The chief struggle was expected in the House of Lords. . . . The vote here was favorable beyond all hopes, resulting on March 8th in a majority in favor of the law almost as great as that in the House of Deputies.

. By no means calm was the attitude of the pope towards the increasing complications, and when, a few weeks later, on June 24th, 1872, he received the German 'Leseverein' in Rome he complained bitterly of the prime minister of a powerful government who, after marvellous successes in war, should have placed himself at the head of a long-planned persecution of the church; a step which would undoubtedly tarnish the glory of his former triumphs 'Who knows if the little stone shall not soon be loosened from above that shall destroy the foot of the Colossus!' The chief cause of this bitterness lay in the expulsion of the Jesuits which had meanwhile been decreed by the diet . . .

The more the national opposition to the Roman claims increased, the more passionate did the frame of mind of the ultramontanes become, and also, in no small degree, of the pope. An allocution addressed to the cardinals on December 22, 1872, surpassed in violence any thing that had yet been heard. . . Even Reichensperger found it advisable in excusing a vehemence that thus went beyond all bounds to call to mind that the Latinized style of the papal chancery was not to be taken too literally. The German government, after such a demonstration, had no other alternative than to recall the last representative of its embassy to the papal court .

Already in November Minister Falk had laid before the House a draft of a law concerning the limits of ecclesiastical punishments and disciplinary measures, on January 9, 1873, followed the drafts of three new laws . . . Still more passionately than in the debate concerning the change in the Constitution did Bismarck come forward in the discussion of April 24-28 . . . Windthorst and Schorlemer also answered him back in kind . With violent attacks on Bismarck they prophesied that these Draconic laws would rebound against the passive opposition of the people, that dawn was glimmering in men's minds and that the victory of the Church was near . To the great majority of the German people who had followed the political ecclesiastical debates with the liveliest interest, such assurances seemed almost laughable. They felt sure of victory now that Bismarck himself had seized the standard with such decision .

The 'May Laws' which the king signed on May 11, 1873, were considered a weapon sure to be effectual, and even the advanced-liberal, who had followed many of the steps of the Government with hesitation and doubt, declared in an appeal to their electors on March 23 that the conflict had assumed the proportions of a great struggle for enlightenment (Kulturkampf), in which all mankind were concerned, and that they themselves, in junction with the other liberal parties, would accordingly support the Government. . . On August 7 (1873) Pius IX sent a letter to the emperor under pretext of having heard that the latter did not sympathize with the latest measures of his government. He declared that such measures seemed to aim at the annihilation of catholicism and warned him that their final result would be to undermine the throne. He deduced his right to issue this warning from the fact that he was bound to tell the truth to all, even to non-catholics: for in one way or another—exactly how this was not the place to make clear—every one who had received baptism belonged to the pope. The emperor

answered on September 3rd in a most dignified tone. . . 'We can not pass over in silence the remark that every one who has been baptized belongs to the pope. The evangelical faith which I, as your Holiness must know, like my forefathers and together with the majority of my subjects, confess, does not allow us to accept any other Mediator in our relations with God save our Lord Jesus Christ'. . . Among protestants this royal answer was greeted with jubilant acclamations and even in foreign lands it found a loud echo. The aged Earl Russell organized a great meeting in London on January 27, 1874 . . . Soon after the opening of the Prussian diet Falk could bring forward the draft of a law which handed over to state-officials [Standesbeamte] all matters referring to the celebration of marriages and the registration of civil personal matters. This draft was sure from the first of a good majority.

On March 9th, 1874, the law could be proclaimed. In the same month still the deputies Hinschius and Völk made a motion in the diet to introduce civil marriages throughout the whole empire . . . It furthermore seemed necessary to take stronger measures against bishops and priests unlawfully appointed and whom the state had either deposed or refused to recognize. The mildest measure was to remove them from their dioceses or parishes, to banish them to certain fixed places and in the worst cases, to expel them altogether from the lands of the empire.

The draft of the law (to this effect) was warmly supported and at last, April 25, 1874, was accepted by a vote of 214 to 208 . . . On July 13th, 1874, as Prince Bismarck, who had gone to take the cure in Kissingen, was driving to the Saline, the twenty one year old cooper's-apprentice Kullmann, of Magdeburg, fired a pistol at him, and wounded him in his right hand which he had just raised for the purpose of saluting . At once arrested, Kullmann declared to the chancellor, who visited him an hour later in his prison, that he had wished to murder him on account of the laws against the church. . . The reading of ultramontane papers and the violent discourses of the catholic clergy had driven him to the deed. He atoned for it with fourteen years in the House of Correction. Not alone did public opinion make ultramontanism accountable for the deed, but Bismarck himself laid very strong emphasis on the fact that the criminal had spoken of the Centre as 'his party.' 'You may try as hard as you please to rid yourselves of this murderer,' he cried out in the diet of December 4th, 'he none the less holds fast to your coat-tails!'—C. Bulle, *Geschichte der neuesten Zeit* (trans. from the German), v. 4, pp. 20-41.—At the Session of the Lower House of the Prussian Diet, January 30, 1872, Deputy Windthorst spoke in opposition to the royal order for the abolition of the separate Roman Catholic section of the department of worship and public instruction, and Prince Bismarck, in reply, said: "The party to which the gentleman belongs has contributed its share to the difficulty of obliterating the denominational standpoint in matters political. I have always considered it one of the most monstrous manifestations in politics, that a religious faction should convert itself into a political party. If all the other creeds were to adopt the same principle, it would bring theology into the parliamentary sessions and would make it a matter of public

debate . . It has always been one of my fundamental principles that every creed ought to have full liberty of development, perfect liberty of conscience . But for all that I did not think it was a necessary corollary that a census of each denomination be taken merely for the purpose of giving each its proportional share in the Civil Service . Where will you stop? You begin with a Cabinet then you count the Chiefs of Division . I do not know what your ratio is—I think you claim four to seven—nor do I care to know . The subordinates in the Civil Service follow next . It is a fact, moreover, that the Evangelicals are by no means united in one denomination . The contrast is not merely between Protestants and Catholics . The United Prussian Established Church, the Lutheran Church, the Reformed Church, all have claims analogous to those of the Catholics . As soon as we cut up the state into denominational sections, giving each creed its proportional share, then the large Jewish population will come in for its part, a majority of which, distinguished by its special capacity, skill and intelligence is peculiarly fitted for the business of the State .

We cannot admit the claim of the ecclesiastical authorities to a further share in the administration and in the interest of peace we are obliged to restrict the share they already have, so that we may have room beside each other and be obliged, as little as possible, to trouble ourselves about theology in this place . —*The politischen Reden des Fürsten Bismarck (trans. from the German), v. 5, pp. 231-240*—In the German Parliament, May 14, 1872, on the question of a grant of 19,350 thalers for the German embassy at the See of Rome Prince Bismarck spoke as follows: “I can easily understand how in considering this item of the estimates, the opinion may be held that the expenditure for this embassy was superfluous, as it does no longer consider the protection of German citizens in foreign parts . Still I am glad that no motion for the striking out of this post was made, which would be unpleasant to the Government . The duties of an embassy consist not merely in affording protection to their countrymen but also in keeping up the political relations of the Government which it represents with that to which it is accredited . Now there is no foreign sovereign, who, in the present state of our laws, might be called upon to exercise, in accordance with those laws, prerogatives in the German empire like those of His Holiness, approaching almost to sovereignty, limited by no constitutional responsibility . There is therefore great importance for the German empire in the character that is given to our diplomatic relations with the head of the Roman Church, wielding, as he does, an influence in this country unusually extensive for a foreign potentate . I scarcely believe, considering the spirit dominant at present in the leading circles of the Catholic Church, that any ambassador of the German empire could succeed, by the most skilful diplomacy, or by persuasion (communimatory attitudes conceivable between secular powers are out of the question here)—I say no one could succeed by persuasion in exerting an influence to bring about a modification of the position assumed by His Holiness the Pope towards things secular . The dogmas of the Catholic Church recently announced and publicly promulgated make it impossible for any

secular power to come to an understanding with the church without its own effacement, which the German empire, at least, cannot accept . Have no fear, we shall not go to Canossa, either in body or in spirit . Nevertheless it cannot be concealed that the state of the German empire (it is not my task here to investigate the motives and determine how much blame attaches to one party or the other; I am only defending an item in the Budget)—that the feeling within the German empire in regard to religious peace, is one of disquietude . The governments of the German empire are seeking, with all the solicitude they owe to their Catholic as well as Lutheran subjects for the best way, the most acceptable means, of changing the present unpleasant state of affairs in matters of religion to a more agreeable one, without disturbing to any degree the credal relations of the empire . This can only be done by way of legislation—of general imperial legislation—for which the governments have to rely upon the assistance of the Reichstag . That this legislation must not in the least infringe upon the liberty of conscience, — must proceed in the gentlest, most conciliatory manner that the government must bend all its energies in order to prevent unnecessary retardation of its work, from incorrect recording or errors in form, you all will admit . That the governments must spare no efforts for the establishment of our internal peace, in a manner least offensive even to the religious sensitiveness of those whose creed we do not share, you will also admit . To this end, however, it is before all things needful that the Roman See be at all times well informed of the intentions of the German governments, much better than it has been hitherto . The reports made in the past to His Holiness the Pope, on the state of affairs in Germany and on the intentions of the German governments, I consider as one of the chief causes of the present disturbances of denominational relations, for those presentations were both incorrect and perverted, either by personal bias, or by base motives . I had hoped that the choice of an ambassador, who had the full confidence of both parties, both on account of his love of truth and reliability, and on account of the nature of his views and his attitude—that the choice of such an ambassador as His Majesty had made in the person of a distinguished prince of the church [Cardinal Prince Hohenlohe] would be welcomed at Rome; that it would be taken as an earnest of our peaceable and conciliatory intentions; that it would be utilized as a means to our mutual understanding . I had hoped that it would afford the assurance that we would never ask anything of His Holiness, but what a prince of the church, sustaining the most intimate relations to the Pope, could present before him; that the forms with which one sacerdotal dignitary confers with another would continue to prevail and that all unnecessary friction in a matter so difficult in itself would be avoided . . . All this we had hoped to attain . But alas! for reasons which have not yet been submitted to us, a curt refusal on the part of the Papal See frustrated the intentions of His Majesty . I dare say such an incident does not often occur . It is customary, when a sovereign has made choice of an ambassador, out of courtesy to make inquiry at the court to which the chosen

ambassador is to be accredited, whether he be *persona grata* or not. The case of a negative reply, however, is extremely rare, bringing about, as it must, a revocation of the appointment made not provisionally, but definitely, before the inquiry. Such a negative reply is equal to a demand to annul what has been done, to a declaration. 'You have chosen unwisely' I have now been Foreign Minister for ten years, have been busy in matters of higher diplomacy for twenty-one years, and I can positively assert that this is the first and only case in my experience of such an inquiry receiving a negative reply." Deputy Windthorst, in reply, criticised the procedure of the German Government in this affair, and justified the position taken by the papal court, saying "I believe, gentlemen, for my part, that it was the duty of the Cardinal to ask the permission of his master, the Pope, before accepting the post. The Cardinal was the servant of the Pope, and as such, could not accept an office from another government without previous inquiry. . . . The case would be the same if His Holiness had appointed an adjutant general of His Majesty as papal nuncio, only more flagrant, for you will admit that a Cardinal is quite a different person from an adjutant general." Prince Bismarck replied "I do not wish to discuss here the personal criticism which the gentleman made on His Eminence, the Cardinal, but I would say a word about the expression 'master' which was used. The gentleman is certainly well versed in history, especially ecclesiastical history, and I wish to ask him, who was the master of Cardinal Richelieu or Cardinal Mazarin? Both of these dignitaries were engaged in controversies and had to settle important differences with the See of Rome, in the service of their sovereign, the king of France; and yet they were Cardinals. . . . If it should please His Holiness to appoint an adjutant general of His Majesty as papal nuncio, I should unconditionally advise His Majesty to accept him . . . I am an enemy to all conjectural politics and all prophesies. That will take care of itself. But I can assure the gentleman that we will maintain the full integral sovereignty of the law with all means at our disposal, against assumptions of individual subjects of His Majesty, the king of Prussia, be they priests or laymen, that there could be laws of the land not binding upon them; and we are sure of the entire support of a great majority of the members of all religious confessions. The sovereignty can and must be one and integral, — the sovereignty of the law; and he who declares the laws of his country as not binding upon himself, places himself outside the pale of the law." — *Die politischen Reden des Fürsten Bismarck (trans. from the German), v. 5, pp. 337-344* — The following is from a speech of Prince Bismarck in the Upper House, March 10, 1873, during the discussion of the May Laws: "The gentleman who spoke before me has entered on the same path which the opponents of these bills followed in the other house by ascribing to them a confessional, I might say, an ecclesiastical character. The question we are considering is, according to my view, misconstrued, and the light in which we consider it, a false light if we look upon it as a confessional, a church question. It is essentially a political one; it is not, as our *catholic* fellow citizens are made to believe,

a contest of an evangelical dynasty against the Catholic Church; it is not a struggle between faith and unbelief; it is the perennial contest, as old as the human race, between royalty and priesthood, older than the appearance of our Savior on earth. This contest was carried on by Agamemnon at Aulis, which cost him his daughter and hindered the Grecian fleet from going to sea. This contest has filled the German history of the Middle Ages even to the disintegration of the German Empire. It is known as the struggles of the popes with the emperors, closing for the Middle Ages when the last representative of the noble Suabian imperial dynasty died on the block beneath the axe of the French conqueror, that French conqueror being in league with the then ruling pope. We were very near an analogous solution of this question, translated into the manners of our own time. Had the French war of conquest been successful, the outbreak of which coincided with the publication of the Vatican Decrees, I know not what would have been narrated in Church circles of Germany of 'gestis Dei per Francos' ['Gesta Dei per Francos,' 'Deeds of God by the French' is the title of a collection by Bongars, containing the sources of the history of the crusades.—Footnote j] It is in my opinion a falsification of history and politics, this attitude of considering His Holiness, the Pope, exclusively as the high priest of a religious denomination, or the Catholic Church as the representative of Churchdom merely. The papacy has at all times been a political power, interfering in the most resolute manner and with the greatest success in the secular affairs of this world, which interference it contended for and made its program. These programs are well known. The aim which was constantly present in its mind's eye, the program which in the Middle Ages was near its realization, was the subjection of the secular powers to the Church, an eminently political aim, a striving as old as mankind itself. For there have always been either some wise men, or some real priests who set up the claim, that the will of God was better known to them than to their fellow beings and in consequence of this claim they had the right to rule over their fellowmen. And it cannot be denied that this proposition contains the basis of the papal claims for the exercise of sovereign rights. . . . The contention of priesthood against royalty, in our case, of the Pope against the German Emperor, . . . is to be judged like every other struggle; it has its alliances, its peace conventions, its pauses, its armistices. There have been peaceful popes, there have been popes militant, popes conquerors. There have been even peace-loving kings of France, though Louis XVI. was forced to carry on wars; so that even our French neighbors have had monarchs who preferred peace to war. Moreover, in the struggles of the papal power it has not always been the call that Catholic powers have been exclusively the allies of the pope; nor have the priests always sided with the pope. We have had cardinals as ministers of great powers at a time when those great powers followed an antipapal policy even to acts of violence. We have found bishops in the military retinue of the German emperors, when moving against the popes. This contest for power therefore is subject to the same condition as every other political contest, and it is a mis-

representation of the issue, calculated to impress people without judgment of their own, when it is characterized as aiming at the oppression of the church. Its object is the defense of the state, to determine the limits of priestly rule, of royal power and thus limit must secure the existence of the state. For in the kingdom of this world the rule and the precedence is the state's.

In the paragraphs of the constitution we have under consideration we found a 'modus vivendi' an armistice concluded at a time when the state was in need of help and thought to obtain this help or at least some support in the Catholic Church. This hope was based upon the fact that at the election for the national assembly of 1848 the districts in which the Catholic population preponderated elected if not royalists yet friends of order — which was not the case in evangelical districts. Under this impression the compromise between the ecclesiastical and secular arms was concluded though as subsequent events proved, in miscalculation as to its practical effects. For it was not the support of the electors who had thus voted but the Brundenburg ministry and the royal army that restored order. In the end the state was obliged to help itself the aid that might have been given by the different churches did not pull it through. But at that time originated the 'modus vivendi' under which we lived in peace for a number of years. To be sure, this peace was bought only by an uninterrupted yielding of the state. When we were yet in Versailles I was somewhat surprised to learn, that Catholic members of parliamentary bodies were asked to declare whether they were ready to join a religious party such as we have now in the Party of the Centre and whether they would agree to vote and agitate for the insertion of the paragraphs we are at present considering into the constitution of the Empire. I was not much alarmed then at that program. When I returned here I saw how strong was the organization of this party of the church militant against the state. Its object was the introduction of a state dualism in Prussia, the erection of a state within the state to bring it about that all Catholics should follow the

guidance of this Party of the Centre in their private as well as their political conduct, a dualism of the worst kind. If this program were carried out we were to have instead of the one formerly integral state of Prussia, instead of the German Empire then at the point of realization — we were to have two state organizations, running side by side in parallel lines, one with the Party of the Centre as its general staff, the other with its general staff in the guiding secular principle, in the government and the person of His Majesty the Emperor. This situation was absolutely unacceptable for the government whose very duty it was to defend the state against such a danger. It would have misunderstood and neglected this duty if it had looked on calmly at the astounding progress which a closer examination of the affair brought to light. The Government was obliged to terminate the armistice based upon the constitution of 1848 and create a new 'modus vivendi' between the secular and sacerdotal power. The state cannot allow this situation to continue without being driven into internal struggles that may endanger its very existence. The question is simply this. Are those paragraphs of the constitution [of 1848] dangerous to the state?" — *Die politischen Reden des Fürsten Bismarck* (trans from the German) v. 5, pp. 384-391. See also GERMANY A.D. 1873-1891.

A.D. 1878 — Election of Leo XIII.

A.D. 1891 — Disestablishment of the Church in Brazil. See BRAZIL A.D. 1889-1891.

A.D. 1892 — Mission of an Apostolic Delegate to the United States of America — In October, 1892 Monsignor Francisco Satolli arrived in the United States commissioned by the Pope as Apostolic Delegate with powers described in the following terms: "We command all whom it concerns" says the Head of the Church "to recognize in you as Apostolic Delegate the supreme power of the delegating Pontiff, we command that they give you aid, concurrence and obedience in all things, that they receive with reverence your salutary admonitions and orders" — *Forum, May 1893* (p. 15, p. 278).

PAPAGOS, The. See AMERICAN ABORIGINES, PIMAN FAMILY, and PUEBLOS

PAPAL GUARANTEES, Law of the. See PAPACY A.D. 1870

PAPAL STATES. See STATES OF THE CHURCH, also PAPACY

PAPER BLOCKADE. See BLOCKADE, PAPER

PAPER MONEY. See MONEY AND BANKING

PAPLAGONIANS, The. — A people who anciently inhabited the southern coast of the Euxine, from the mouth of the Kizil Irmaik to Cape Baba. — G. Rawlinson, *Five Great Monarchies of Persia*, ch. 1 — Paphlagonia formed part, in succession, of the dominions of Lydia, Persia, Pontus, Bithynia, and Rome, but was often governed by local princes.

PAPIN, Inventions of. See STEAM ENGINE

PAPINEAU REBELLION, The. See CANADA A.D. 1837-1838

PAPUA. See NEW GUINEA.

PAPUANS, The. — "In contrast to the Polynesians, both in color of skin and shape of skull, are the crispy-haired black dolichocephalic Pap-

uans, whose centre is in the large and little known island of New Guinea, from whence they spread over the neighboring islands to the southeast, the Louisades, New Caledonia, New Britain, Solomon Islands, Queen Charlotte Islands, New Hebrides, Loyalty, and Fiji Islands. Turning now to the northward, a similar black race is found in the Eta or Ita of the Philippines (Negritos of the Spanish), whom Meyer, Semper, Peschel, and Hellwald believe to be closely allied to the true Papuan type, and in the interiors of Sumatra, Borneo, Celebes, and Gilolo, and in the mountains of Malacca, and at last in the Andaman Islands, we find peoples closely related; and following Peschel, we may divide the whole of the eastern blacks (excepting of course the Australians) into Asiatic and Australasian Papuans; the latter inhabiting New Guinea and the islands mentioned to the south and east. In other of the islands of the South Seas traces of a black race are to be found, but so mingled with Polynesian and Malay as to render them fit subjects for treatment under the chapters on those races. The name Papua comes from the Malay word *papuah*, crispy-haired, and is the name

which the Malays apply to their black neighbors. In New Guinea, the centre of the Papuans, the name is not known, nor have the different tribes any common name for themselves. In body, conformation of skull, and in general appearance the Papuans present a very close resemblance to the African negroes, and afford a strong contrast to the neighboring Polynesians"—J. S. Kingsley, ed., *The Standard [now called The Riverside], Natural History*, v. 6, p. 42.

ALSO IN: A. R. Wallace, *The Malay Archipelago*, ch. 40.

PARABOLANI OF ALEXANDRIA, The.—"The 'parabolani' of Alexandria were a charitable corporation, instituted during the plague of Gallienus, to visit the sick and to bury the dead. They gradually enlarged, abused, and sold the privileges of their order. Their outrageous conduct under the reign of Cyril [as patriarch of Alexandria] provoked the emperor to deprive the patriarch of their nomination and to restrain their number to five or six hundred. But these restraints were transient and ineffectual"—E. Gibbon, *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, ch. 47, *foot note*.

ALSO IN J. Bingham, *Antiq. of the Christ Ch.*, bk. 3, ch. 9.

PARACELCUS. See MEDICAL SCIENCE 16TH CENTURY

PARAGUAY: The name.—"De Azara tells us that the river Paraguay derives its name from the Payaguas tribe of Indians, who were the earliest navigators on its waters. Some writers deduce the origin of its title from an Indian cacique, called Paraguaio, but Azara says, this latter word has no signification in any known idiom of the Indians, and moreover there is no record of a cacique ever having borne that name."—T. J. Hutchinson, *The Parana*, p. 44.

The aboriginal inhabitants. See AMERICAN ABORIGINES, PAMPAS TRIBES, and TUPI.

A. D. 1515-1557.—Discovery and exploration of La Plata.—Settlement and early years of the peculiar colony.—The Rio de la Plata, or River of Silver, was discovered in 1515 by the Spanish explorer, Juan de Solis, who landed inadvertently and was killed by the natives. In 1519 this "Sweet Sea," as Solis called it, was visited again by Magellan, in the course of the voyage which made known the great strait which bears his name. The first, however, to ascend the important river for any distance, and to attempt the establishing of Spanish settlements upon it, was Sebastian Cabot, in 1526, after he had become chief pilot to the king of Spain. He sailed up the majestic stream to the junction of the Paraguay and the Parana, and then explored both channels, in turn, for long distances beyond. "Cabot passed the following two years in friendly relations with the Guaranis, in whose silver ornaments originated the name of La Plata, and thence of the Argentine Republic, the name having been applied by Cabot to the stream now called the Paraguay. That able and sagacious man now sent to Spain two of his most trusted followers with an account of Paraguay and its resources, and to seek the authority and reinforcements requisite for their acquisition. Their request was favourably received, but so tardily acted on that in despite the distinguished navigator quitted the region of his discoveries after a delay of *four years*." In 1534, the enter-

prise abandoned by Cabot was taken up by a wealthy Spanish courtier, Don Pedro de Mendoza, who received large powers, and who fitted out an expedition of 2,000 men, with 100 horses, taking with him eight priests. Proceeding but a hundred miles up the Plata, Mendoza founded a town on its southwestern shore, which, in compliment to the fine climate of the region, he named Buenos Ayres. As long as they kept at peace with the natives, these adventurers fared well; but when war broke out, as it did ere long, they were reduced to great straits for food. Mendoza, broken down with disappointments and hardships, resigned his powers to his lieutenant, Ayolas, and sailed for home, but died on the way. Ayolas, with part of his followers, ascended to a point on the Paraguay some distance above its junction with the Parana, where he founded a new city, calling it Asuncion. This was in 1537, and Ayolas perished that same year in an attempt to make his way overland to Peru. The survivors of the colony were left in command of an officer named Irala, who proved to be a most capable man. The settlement at Buenos Ayres was abandoned and all concentrated at Asuncion, where they numbered 600 souls. In 1542 they were joined by a new party of 400 adventurers from Spain, who came out with Cabeza de Vaca—a hero of strange adventures in Florida—now appointed Adelantado of La Plata. Cabeza de Vaca had landed with part of his forces on the Brazilian coast, at a point eastward from Asuncion, and boldly marched across country, making an important exploration and establishing friendly relations with the Guaranis. But he was not successful in his government, and the discontented colonists summarily deposed him, shipping him off to Spain, with charges against him, and restoring Irala to the command of their affairs. This irregularity seems to have been winked at by the home authorities, and Irala was scarcely interfered with for a number of years. "The favourable reports which had reached Spain of the climate and capabilities of Paraguay were such as to divert thither many emigrants who would otherwise have turned their faces toward Mexico or Peru. It was the constant endeavour of Irala to level the distinctions which separated the Spaniards from the natives and to encourage intermarriages between them. This policy, in the course of time, led to a marked result,—namely, to that singular combination of outward civilization and of primitive simplicity which was to be found in the modern Paraguayan race until it was annihilated under the younger Lopez. . . . Irala, in fact, created a nation. The colony under his administration became numerous and wealthy. . . . He was the life and soul of the colony, and his death, which occurred in 1557 at the village of Ita, near Asuncion, when he had attained the age of 70 years, was lamented alike by Spaniards and Guaranis. . . . The Spaniards brought with them few if any women, and if a certain proportion of Spanish ladies arrived later they were not in sufficient numbers to affect the general rule, which was that the Spanish settlers were allied to Guarani wives. Thus was formed the modern mixed Paraguayan race. In a very short time, therefore, by means of the ties of relationship, a strong sympathy grew up between the Spaniards and the Guaranis, or those of Guarani blood, and a recognition of this fact formed the

basis of the plan of government founded by the great Irala. The lot of the natives of Paraguay, as compared with the natives of the other Spanish dominions in the New World, was far from being a hard one. There were no mines to work. The Spaniards came there to settle, rather than to amass fortunes with which to return to Europe. The country was abundantly fertile, and such wealth as the Spaniards might amass consisted in the produce of their fields or the increase of their herds, which were amply sufficient to support them. Consequently, all they required of the natives, for the most part, was a moderate amount of service as labourers or as herdsmen."—R. G. Watson, *Spanish and Portuguese South Am.*, v. 1, ch. 5 and 18.

ALSO IN R. Southey, *Hist. of Brazil*, v. 1, ch. 2-3, 5-7, and 11.—R. Biddle, *Memoir of S. Cabot*, ch. 16-23.—Father Charlevoix, *Hist. of Paraguay*, bk. 1-3.

A. D. 1608-1873.—The rule of the Jesuits.—The Dictatorship of Dr. Francia and of Lopez I. and Lopez II.—Disastrous War with Brazil.—"Under Spanish rule, from the early part of the 16th century as a remote dependency of Peru, and subsequently of Buenos Ayres, Paraguay had been almost entirely abandoned to the Jesuits [see JESUITS: A. D. 1542-1649] as a virgin ground on which to try the experiment of their idea of a theocratic government. The Loyola Brethren, first brought in in 1608, baptized the Indian tribes, built towns, founded missions [and communities of converts called Reductions, meaning that they had been reduced into the Christian faith], gave the tamed savages pacific, industrious, and passively obedient habits, married them by wholesale, bidding the youth of the two sexes stand up in opposite rows, and saving them the trouble of a choice by pointing out to every Jack his Jenny, drilled and marshalled them to their daily tasks in processions and at the sound of the church bells, headed by holy images; and in their leisure hours amused them with Church ceremonies and any amount of music and dancing and merry-making. They allowed each family a patch of ground and a grove of banana and other fruit trees for their sustenance, while they claimed the whole bulk of the land for themselves as 'God's patrimony,' bidding those well-disciplined devotees save their souls by slaving with their bodies in behalf of their ghostly masters and instructors. With the whole labouring population under control, these holy men soon waxed so strong as to awe into subjection the few white settlers whose estates dated from the conquest; and by degrees, extending their sway from the country into the towns, and even into the capital, Asuncion, they set themselves above all civil and ecclesiastical authority, snubbing the intendente of the province and worrying the bishop of the diocese. Driven away by a fresh outburst of popular passions in 1731, and brought back four years later by the strong hand of the Spanish Government, they made common cause with it, truckled to the lay powers whom they had set at naught, and shared with them the good things which they had at first enjoyed undivided. All this till the time of the general crusade of the European powers against their order, when they had to depart from Paraguay as well as from all other Spanish dominions in 1767. In the early part of the

present century, when the domestic calamities of Spain determined a general collapse of her power in the American colonies, Paraguay raised its cry for independence, and constituted itself into a separate Republic in 1811. But, although the party of emancipation was the strongest and seized the reins of government, there were still many among the citizens who clung to their connection with the mother country, and these were known as Peninsulares, and there were many more who favoured the scheme of a federal union of Paraguay with the Republics of the Plate, and these went by the name of Portefrios, owing to the importance they attached to the dependence of their country on Buenos Ayres (the puerto or harbour), the only outlet as well as the natural head of the projected confederation [see ARGENTINE REPUBLIC: A. D. 1580-1777]. All these dissenters were soon disposed of by the ruthless energy of one man, Juan Gaspar Rodriguez, known under the name of Dr. Francia. This man, the son of a Mamaluco, or Brazilian half caste, with Indian blood in his veins, a man of stern, gloomy and truculent character, with a mixture of scepticism and stoicism, was one of those grim, yet grotesque, heroes according to Mr. Carlyle's heart whom it is now the fashion to call 'Saviours of society.' A Doctor of Divinity, issuing from the Jesuit seminary at Cordova, but practising law at Asuncion, he made his way from the Municipal Council to the Consular dignity of the New Republic, and assumed a Dictatorship, which laid the country at his discretion (1814-1840), wielding the most unbounded power till his death, at the advanced age of 83. With a view, or under pretext of stifling discontent and baffling conspiracy within and warding off intrigue or aggression from without, he rid himself of his colleagues, rivals, and opponents, by wholesale executions, imprisonments, proscriptions, and confiscations, and raised a kind of Chinese wall all round the Paraguayan territory, depriving it of all trade or intercourse, and allowing no man to enter or quit his dominions without an express permission from himself. Francia's absolutism was a monomania, though there was something like method in his madness. There were faction and civil strife and military rule in Paraguay for about a twelvemonth after his death. In the end, a new Constitution, new Consuls—one of whom, Carlos Antonio Lopez, a lawyer, took upon himself to modify the Charter in a strictly despotic sense, had himself elected President, first for ten years, then for three, and again for ten more, managing thus to reign alone and supreme for 21 years (1841-1862). On his demise he bequeathed the Vice-Presidency to his son, Francisco Solano Lopez, whom he had already trusted with the command of all the forces, and who had no difficulty in having himself appointed President for life in an Assembly where there was only one negative vote. The rule of Francia in his later years, and that of the first Lopez throughout his reign, though tyrannical and economically improvident, had not been altogether unfavourable to the development of public prosperity. The population, which was only 87,480 in 1796 and 400,000 in 1828, had risen to 1,887,481 at the census of 1857. Paraguay had then a revenue of 13,441,828£., no debt, no paper money, and the treasury was so full as to enable Lopez II. to muster an army of

62,000 men, with 200 pieces of artillery, in the field and in his fortresses. Armed with this two-edged weapon, the new despot, whose perverse and violent temper bordered on insanity, corrupted by several years' dissipation in Paris, and swayed by the influence of a strong and evil-minded woman, flattered also by the skill he fancied he had shown when he played at soldiers as his father's general in early youth, had come to look upon himself as a second Napoleon, and allowed himself no rest till he had picked a quarrel with all his neighbours and engaged in a war with Brazil and with the Republics of the Plate, which lasted five years (1865-1870) [see BRAZIL. A. D. 1825-1865]. At the end of it nearly the whole of the male population had been led like sheep to the slaughter, and the tyrant himself died 'in the last ditch,' not indeed fighting like a man, but killed like a dog when his flight was cut off, and not before he had sacrificed 100,000 of his combatants, doomed to starvation, sickness, and unutterable hardship a great many of the scattered and houseless population (400,000, as it is calculated), and so ruined the country that the census of 1873 only gave 221,079 souls, of whom the females far more than doubled the males"—A. Gallenga, *South America*, ch. 16.

Also in: Father Charlevoix, *Hist. of Paraguay*.—J. R. Rengger and Longchamps, *The Reign of Dr Francia*.—T. Carlyle, *Dr Francia (Essays, v. 6)*.—C. A. Washburn, *Hist. of Paraguay*.—R. F. Burton, *Letters from the Battle-fields of Paraguay*.—T. J. Page, *La Plata, the Argentine Confederation and Paraguay*, ch. 27-30.—T. Griesinger, *The Jesuits*, bk. 2, ch. 1 (v. 1).—J. E. Darras, *General Hist. of the Catholic Church, period 7*, ch. 7 (v. 4).

A. D. 1870-1894.—The Republic under a new Constitution.—Since the death of Lopez, the republic of Paraguay has enjoyed a peaceful, uneventful history and has made fair progress in recovery from its prostration. The Brazilian army of occupation was withdrawn in 1876. Under a new constitution, the executive authority is entrusted to a president, elected for four years, and the legislative to a congress of two houses, senate and deputies. Don Juan G. Gonzales entered, in 1890, upon a presidential term which expires in 1894.

PARALI, The. See ATHENS. B. C 594.

PARALUS, The.—The official vessel of the ancient Athenian government, for the conveyance of despatches and other official service.

PARASANG, The.—The parasang was an ancient Persian measure of distance, about which there is no certain knowledge. Xenophon and Herodotus represented it as equivalent to 80 Greek stadia; but Strabo regarded it as being of variable length. Modern opinion seems to incline toward agreement with Strabo, and to conclude that the parasang was a merely rough estimate of distance, averaging, according to computations by Colonel Chesney and others, something less than three geographical miles. The modern farsang or farsakh of Persia is likewise an estimated distance, which generally, however, overruns three geographical miles.—E. H. Bunting, *Hist. of Ancient Geog.*, ch. 10, note B (v. 1).

PARAWIANAS, The. See AMERICAN ABORIGINES: CARTH AND THEIR KINDEED.

PARICANIANS, The.—The name given by Herodotus to a people who anciently occupied the territory of modern Baluchistan.—G. Rawlinson, *Five Great Monarchs, Persia*, ch. 1.

PARILIA, OR PULILIA, The.—The anniversary of the foundation of Rome, originally a shepherds' festival. It was celebrated on the 21st of April.—C. Meilvale, *Hist. of the Romans*, ch. 21, with foot-note.

PARIS: The beginning.—A small island in the Seine, which now forms an almost insignificant part of the great French capital, was the site of a rude town called Lutetia, or Luketia, or Lucotetia, when Caesar extended the dominion of Rome over that part of Gaul. It was the chief town or stronghold of the Parisii, one of the minor tribes of the Gallic people, who were under the protection of the more powerful Senones and who occupied but a small territory. They were engaged in river traffic on the Seine and seem to have been prosperous, then and afterwards. "Strabo calls this place Lucototia; Ptolemy, Lucotetia, Julian, Luketia; Ammianus calls it at first Lutetia, and afterward Parisii, from the name of the people." It is not known when nor why the designation was changed, but it is supposed to have been changed during the reign of Julian. Three laws in the Theodosian Code, referred to Valentinian and Valens, for the year 365, bear date at Paris, and since then this name has been preserved in all the histories and public records.—P. Godwin, *Hist. of France: Ancient Gaul*, bk. 2, ch. 7, note.—See GAUL: B. C. 58-51.

Julian's residence.—Before Julian ("the Apostate") became emperor, while, as Caesar (355-361), he governed Gaul, his favorite residence, when not in camp or in the field, was at the city of the Parisii, which he called his "dear Luketia." The change of name to Parisii (whence resulted the modern name of Paris) is supposed to have taken place during his subsequent reign. "Commanding the fruitful valleys of the Seine, the Marne, and the Oise, the earliest occupants were merchants and boatmen, who conducted the trade of the rivers, and as early as the reign of Tiberius had formed a powerful corporation. During the revolts of the Bagauds in the third century, it acquired an unhappy celebrity as the stronghold from which they harassed the peace of the surrounding region. Subsequently, when the advances of the Germans drove the government from Trèves, the emperors selected the town of the Parisii as a more secure position. They built a palace there, and an entrenched camp for the soldiers; and very soon afterward several of those aqueducts and amphitheatres which were inseparable accompaniments of Roman life. It was in that palace, which the traveller still regards with curiosity in those mouldering remains of it known as the 'Palais des Thermes,' that Julian found his favorite residence."—P. Godwin, *Hist. of France: Ancient Gaul*, bk. 2, ch. 7.

The capital of Clovis.—Clovis, the Frank conqueror—founder of the kingdom of the united Frank tribes in Gaul—fixed his residence first at Soissons [486], after he had overthrown Syagrius. "He afterwards chose Paris for his abode, where he built a church dedicated to the apostles St. Peter and St. Paul. But the epoch at which that town passed into his power is

uncertain."—J. C. L. de Sismondi, *The French under the Merovingians*, ch. 5.

A. D. 511-752.—Under the Merovingians. See FRANCE: A D 511-752.

A. D. 845.—Sacked by the Normans.—"France was heavily afflicted, a fearfully cold year was followed by another still colder and more inclement. The North wind blew incessantly all through the Winter, all through the pale and leafless Spring. The roots of the vines were perished by the frost—the wolves starved out of their forests, even in Aquitaine . . . Meanwhile the Danish hosts were in bright activity. Regner Lodbrok and his fellows fitted out their fleet, ten times twelve dragons of the sea. Early in the bleak Spring they sailed, and the stout built vessels ploughed cheerily through the crashing ice on the heaving Seine. . . . Rouen dared not offer any opposition. The Northmen quietly occupied the City: we apprehend that some knots or bands of the Northmen began even now to domicile themselves there, it being scarcely possible to account for the condition of Normandy under Rollo otherwise than by the supposition, that the country had long previously received a considerable Danish population. Paris, the point to which the Northmen were advancing by land and water, was the key of France, properly so called. Paris taken, the Seine would become a Danish river: Paris defended, the Danes might be restrained, perhaps expelled. The Capetian 'Duchy of France,' not yet created by any act of State, was beginning to be formed through the increasing influence of the future Capital. . . . Fierce as the Northmen generally were, they exceeded their usual ferocity. . . . With such panic were the Franks stricken, that they gave themselves up for lost. Paris island, Paris river, Paris bridges, Paris towers, were singularly defensible; the Palais des-Thermes, the monasteries, were as so many castles. Had the inhabitants, for their own sakes, co-operated with Charles-le-Chauve [who had stationed himself with a small army at Saint Denis], the retreat of the Danes would have been entirely cut off, but they were palsied in mind and body; neither thought of resistance nor at tempted resistance, and abandoned themselves to despair. On Easter Eve [March 28, 845] the Danes entered Paris. . . . The priests and clerks deserted their churches: the monks fled, bearing with them their shrines. soldiers, citizens and sailors abandoned their fortresses, dwellings and vessels: the great gate was left open, Paris emptied of her inhabitants, the city a solitude. The Danes bled at once to the untenant monasteries: all valuable objects had been removed or concealed, but the Northmen employed themselves after their fashion. In the church of Saint-Germain-des-prés, they swarmed up the pillars and galleries, and pulled the roof to pieces: the larchen beams being sought as excellent ship-timber. In the city, generally, they did not commit much devastation. They lodged themselves in the empty houses, and plundered all the moveables. . . . The Franks did not make any attempt to attack or dislodge the enemy, but a more efficient power compelled the Danes to retire from the city; disease raged among them, dysentery—a complaint frequently noticed, probably occasioned by their inordinate potations of the country-wine." Under these circumstances, Regner Lodbrok consented to

quit Paris on receiving 7,000 pounds of silver,—a sum reckoned to be equivalent to 520,000 livres. "This was the first Danegeld paid by France, an unhappy precedent, and yet unavoidable: the pusillanimity of his subjects compelled Charles to adopt this disgraceful compromise."—Sir F. Palgrave, *Hist. of Normandy and England*, bk. 1, ch. 3 (v. 1).

Also in: C. F. Keary, *The Vikings in Western Christendom*, ch. 9.

A. D. 857-861.—Twice ravaged by the Northmen.—"The Seine as well as the future Duchy of France being laid open to the Northmen [A. D. 857], Paris, partially recovered from Regner Lodbrok's invasion, was assailed with more fell intent. The surrounding districts were ravaged, and the great monasteries, heretofore sacked, were now destroyed. Only three churches were found standing—Saint Denis, Saint-Germain des-prés, and Saint-Etienne or Notre-Dame—these having redeemed themselves by contributions to the enemy, but Saint Denis made a bad bargain. The Northmen did not hold to their contract, or another company of pirates did not consider it as binding—the monastery was burnt to a shell, and a most heavy ransom paid for the liberation of Abbot Louis, Charlemagne's grandson by his daughter Rothilda. Sainte Genéviève suffered most severely amongst all; and the pristine beauty of the structure rendered the calamity more conspicuous and the distress more poignant. During three centuries the desolated grandeur of the shattered ruins continued to excite sorrow and dread. . . . Amongst the calamities of the times, the destruction of the Parisian monasteries seems to have worked peculiarly on the imagination. After this destructive visitation the city had rest for only three years. In 861 a fresh horde of Danish pirates, first harrying the English coast and burning Winchester, swept then across the channel and swarmed over the country from Scheidt to Seine. Amiens, Nimeguen, Bayeux and Terouenne were all taken, on the way, and once more on Easter Day (April 6, 861) the ruthless savages of the North entered Paris. Saint-Germain-des-prés, spared formerly, was now set on fire, and the city was stripped of its movable goods. King Charles the Bald met the enemy on this occasion, as before, with bribes, gave a fief to Jarl Welland, the Danish leader, and presently got him settled in the country as a baptized Christian and a vassal.—Sir F. Palgrave, *Hist. of Normandy and England*, bk. 1, ch. 3 (v. 1).

A. D. 885-886.—The great siege by the Northmen.—"In November, 885, under the reign of Charles the Fat, after having, for more than forty years, irregularly ravaged France, they [the Northmen] resolved to unite their forces in order at length to obtain possession of Paris, whose outskirts they had so often pillaged without having been able to enter the heart of the place, in the Ile de la Cité, which had originally been and still was the real Paris. Two bodies of troops were set in motion; one, under the command of Rollo, who was already famous amongst his comrades, marched on Rouen; the other went right up the course of the Seine, under the orders of Siegfried, whom the Northmen called their king. Rollo took Rouen, and pushed on at once for Paris. . . . On the 25th of November, 886, all the forces of the North

men formed a junction before Paris, 700 huge barks covered two leagues of the Seine, bringing, it is said, more than 80,000 men. The chief-tains were astonished at sight of the new fortifications of the city, a double wall of circumvallation, the bridges crowned with towers, and in the environs the ramparts of the abbeys of St. Denis and St. Germain solidly rebuilt . . . Paris had for defenders two heroes, one of the Church and the other of the Empire [Bishop Gozlin, and Eudes, lately made Count of Paris]. The siege lasted thirteen months, whiles pushed vigorously forward, with eight several assaults, whiles maintained by close investment. The bishop, Gozlin, died during the siege. Count Eudes quitted Paris for a time to go and beg aid of the emperor, but the Parisians soon saw him reappear on the heights of Montmartre with three battalions of troops, and he re-entered the town, spurring on his horse and striking right and left with his battle axe through the ranks of the dumfounded besiegers. The struggle was prolonged throughout the summer, and when in November, 886, Charles the Fat at last appeared before Paris, 'with a large army of all nations' it was to purchase the retreat of the Northmen at the cost of a heavy ransom, and by allowing them to go and winter in Burgundy, 'whereof the inhabitants obeyed not the emperor' — F. P. Guizot, *Popular Hist. of France*, ch. 12 (r. 1)

ALSO IN Sir F. Palgrave, *Hist. of Normandy and Eng.*, bk. 1, ch. 5 — C. F. Keary, *The Vikings in Western Christendom*, ch. 15

A. D. 987.—First becomes the capital of France.—"Nothing is more certain than that Paris never became the capital of France until after the accession of the third dynasty. Paris made the Capets, the Capets made Paris" — Sir F. Palgrave, *Hist. of Normandy and Eng.*, r. 1 p. 280

A. D. 1180-1199.—Improvement of the city by Philip Augustus.—During the few short intervals of peace which had occurred in the hitherto troubled reign of Philip [A. D. 1180-1199], he had not been unmindful of the civil improvement of his people, and the inhabitants of his capital are indebted to his activity for the first attempts to rescue its foul, narrow, and mud-embedded streets from the reproach which its Latin name 'Lutetia' very justly implied. Philip expended much of the treasure, hitherto devoted solely to the revels of the court, in works of public utility, in the construction of paved causeways and aqueducts, in founding colleges and hospitals, in commencing a new city wall, and in the erection of the Cathedral of Notre Dame." — E. Smedley, *Hist. of France*, pt. 1, ch. 4.

A. D. 1328.—The splendor and gaiety of the Court. See FRANCE. A. D. 1328

A. D. 1356-1358.—The building of the Bastille. See BASTILLE

A. D. 1357-1358.—The popular movement under Stephen Marcel. See STATES GENERAL OF FRANCE IN THE 14TH CENTURY.

A. D. 1381.—The insurrection of the Mailloins.—At the beginning of the reign of Charles VI, a tumult broke out in Paris, caused by the imposition of a general tax on merchandise of all kinds. "The Parisians ran to the arsenal, where they found mallets of lead intended for the defence of the town, and under the blows from which the greater part of the collectors of the

new tax perished. From the weapons used the insurgents took the name of Mailloins. Reims, Châlons, Orléans, Blois, and Rouen rose at the example of the capital. The States General of the Langue d' Oïl were then convoked at Compiègne, and separated without having granted anything." The Parisians were always in arms, and the dukes [regents during the minority of the young king], powerless to make them submit, treated with them, and contented themselves with the offer of 100,000 livres. The chastisement was put off for a time." The chastisement of Paris and of the other rebellious towns was inflicted in 1382 (see FLANDERS. A. D. 1382) after the king and his uncles had subdued the Flemings at Rosebeque — E. de Bonnechose, *Hist. of France*, epoch 2, bk. 2, ch. 5

A. D. 1410-1415.—The reign of the Cabochiens.—The civil war of Armagnacs and Burgundians. See FRANCE A. D. 1380-1415.

A. D. 1418.—The massacre of Armagnacs. See FRANCE A. D. 1415-1419.

A. D. 1420-1422.—King Henry V. of England and his court in the city. See FRANCE. A. D. 1417-1422

A. D. 1429.—The repulse of the Maid of Orleans. See FRANCE A. D. 1429-1431

A. D. 1436.—Recovery from the English. See FRANCE A. D. 1431-1458

A. D. 1465.—Siege by the League of the Public Weal. See FRANCE A. D. 1461-1468.

A. D. 1496.—Founding of the press of Henry Estienne. See PRINTING A. D. 1496-1598

A. D. 1567.—The Battle of St. Denis. See FRANCE A. D. 1563-1570

A. D. 1572.—The massacre of St. Bartholomew's Day. See FRANCE A. D. 1572 (AUGUST).

A. D. 1588-1589.—Insurrection of the Catholic League.—The Day of Barricades.—Siege of the city by the king and Henry of Navarre. See FRANCE A. D. 1584-1589

A. D. 1590.—The siege by Henry IV.—Horror of famine and disease.—Relief by the Duke of Parma. See FRANCE A. D. 1590.

A. D. 1594.—Henry IV.'s entry.—Expulsion of Jesuits. See FRANCE A. D. 1593-1598.

A. D. 1636.—Threatening invasion of Spaniards from the Netherlands.—The capital in peril. See NETHERLANDS A. D. 1635-1638

A. D. 1648-1652.—In the wars of the Fronde. See FRANCE A. D. 1647-1648, 1649, 1650-1651, and 1651-1653

A. D. 1652.—The Battle of Porte St. Antoine and the massacre of the Hôtel de Ville. See FRANCE A. D. 1651-1653

A. D. 1789-1799.—Scenes of the Revolution. See FRANCE A. D. 1789 (JUNE), and after

A. D. 1814.—Surrender to the Allied armies. See FRANCE A. D. 1814 (JANUARY-MARCH), and (MARCH-APRIL)

A. D. 1815.—The English and Prussian armies in the city.—Restoration of the art-spoils of Napoleon. See FRANCE: A. D. 1815 (JULY-NOVEMBER).

A. D. 1848 (February).—Revolution.—Abdication and flight of Louis Philippe. See FRANCE A. D. 1841-1848.

A. D. 1848 (March-June).—Creation of the Ateliers Nationaux.—Insurrection consequent on closing them. See FRANCE: A. D. 1848 (FEBRUARY-MAY), and (APRIL-DECEMBER).

A. D. 1851.—The Coup d'Etat. See FRANCE: A. D. 1851; and 1851-1852.

PARIS

A. D. 1870-1871.—*Siege by the Germans.*—
Capitulation. See FRANCE A. D. 1870 (SEPTEMBER—OCTOBER), to 1871 (JANUARY—MAY)

A. D. 1871 (March—May).—The insurgent Commune.—Its Reign of Terror.—Second Siege of the city. See FRANCE A. D. 1871 (MARCH—MAY)

PARIS, Congress of (1856). See RUSSIA
A. D. 1854-1856 and DECLARATION OF PARIS
PARIS, Declaration of See DECLARATION OF PARIS

PARIS, The Parliament of. See PARLIAMENT OF PARIS

PARIS, Treaty of (1763). See SEVEN YEARS WAR THE TREATIES Treaty of (1783). See UNITED STATES OF AM A. D. 1783 (SEPTEMBER) Treaty of (1814) See FRANCE A. D. 1814 (APRIL—JUNE) Treaty of (1815) See FRANCE A. D. 1815 (JULY—NOVEMBER)

PARIS, University of. See EDUCATION MEDIEVAI

PARISII, The. See PARIS THE BEGINNING, and BRITAIN CELTIC TRIBES

PARLIAMENT, The English: Early stages of its evolution—"There is no doubt that in the earliest Teutonic assemblies every freeman had his place. But how as to the great assembly of all, the Assembly of the Wise the Witenagemot of the whole realm [of early England]? No ancient record gives us any clear or formal account of the constitution of that body. It is commonly spoken of in a vague way as a gathering of the wise the noble, the great men. But alongside of passages like these, we find other passages which speak of it in a way which implies a far more popular constitution.

It was in fact a body democratic in ancient theory, aristocratic in ordinary practice, but to which any strong popular impulse could at any time restore its ancient democratic character. Out of this body, whose constitution, by the time of the Norman Conquest had become not a little anomalous, and not a little fluctuating, our Parliament directly grew. Of one House of that Parliament we may say more, we may say, not that it grew out of the ancient Assembly, but that it is absolutely the same by personal identity. The House of Lords not only springs out of, it actually is, the ancient Witenagemot. I can see no break between the two. An assembly in which at first every freeman had a right to appear has, by the force of circumstances, step by step, without any one moment of sudden change, shrunk up into an Assembly wholly hereditary and official, an Assembly to which the Crown may summon any man, but to which, it is now strangely held, the Crown cannot refuse to summon the representatives of any man whom it has once summoned. As in most other things, the tendency to shrink up into a body of this kind began to show itself before the Norman Conquest, and was finally confirmed and established through the results of the Norman Conquest. But the special function of the body into which the old national Assembly has changed, the function of 'another House,' an Upper House, a House of Lords as opposed to a House of Commons, could not show itself till a second House of a more popular constitution had arisen by its side. Like everything else in our

PARLIAMENT

English polity, both Houses in some sort came of themselves. Neither of them was the creation of any ingenious theorist. Our Constitution has no founder, but there is the man to whom we may give all but honours of a founder, one man to whose wisdom and self devotion we owe that English history has taken the course which it has taken for the last 600 years. That man, the man who finally gave to English freedom its second and more lasting shape, the hero and martyr of England in the greatest of her constitutional struggles, was Simon of Montfort, Earl of Leicester. If we may not call him the founder of the English Constitution, we may at least call him the founder of the House of Commons. When we reach the 13th century, we may look on the old Teutonic constitution as having utterly passed away. Some faint traces of it indeed we may find here and there in the course of the 12th century, "but the regular Great Council the lineal representatives of the ancient Mycel Gemot or Witenagemot, was shrinking up into a body not very unlike our House of Lords. The Great Charter secures the rights of the nation and of the national Assembly as against arbitrary legislation and arbitrary taxation on the part of the Crown. But it makes no change in the constitution of the Assembly itself. The Great Charter in short is a Bill of Rights, it is not what in modern phrase we understand by a Reform Bill. But, during the reigns of John and Henry III a popular element was fast making its way into the national Councils in a more practical form. The right of the ordinary freeman to attend in person had long been a shadow, that of the ordinary tenant in chief was becoming hardly more practical, it now begins to be exchanged for what had by this time become the more practical right of choosing representatives to act in his name. Like all other things in England, this right has grown up by degrees and as the result of what we might almost call a series of happy accidents. Both in the reign of John and in the former part of the reign of Henry, we find several instances of knights from each county being summoned. Here we have the beginning of our county members and of the title which they still bear, of knights of the Shire. Here is the beginning of popular representation as distinct from the gathering of the people in their own persons, but we need not think that those who first summoned them had any conscious theories of popular representation. The earliest object for which they were called together was probably a fiscal one, it was a safe and convenient way of getting money. The notion of summoning a small number of men to act on behalf of the whole was doubtless borrowed from the practice in judicial proceedings and in inquests and commissions of various kinds, in which it was usual for certain select men to swear on behalf of the whole shire or hundred. We must not forget . . . that our judicial and our parliamentary institutions are closely connected. . . . But now we come to that great change, that great measure of Parliamentary Reform, which has left to all later reformers nothing to do but to improve in detail. We come to that great act of the patriot Earl which made our popular Chamber really a popular Chamber. . . . When, after the fight of Lewes, Earl Simon, then master of the kingdom, with the King in his cage,

PARLIAMENT.

ing, summoned his famous Parliament [A. D. 1264-5], he summoned, not only two knights from every county, but also two citizens from every city and two burgesses from every borough . . . Thus was formed that newly developed Estate of the Realm which was, step by step, to grow into the most powerful of all, the Commons' House of Parliament"—E. A. Freeman, *Growth of the Eng. Constitution*, ch. 2

Also in: W. Stubbs, *Const. Hist. of Eng.* ch. 6, 13-14—R. Gneist, *The Eng. Parliament*—T. P. Taswell Languedoc, *Eng. Const. Hist.* ch. 7—A. Bissett, *Short Hist. of Eng. Parliament*, ch. 2-3—See, also, *WITENAGEMOT*, ENGLAND A.D. 1216-1274, and KNIGHTS OF THE SHIRE.

A. D. 1244.—Earliest use of the name.—In 1244, "as had happened just one hundred years previously in France, the name 'parliamentum' occurs for the first time [in England] (Chron. Dunst, 1244, Matth. Paris, 1246) and curiously enough, Henry III himself, in a writ addressed to the Sheriff of Northampton, designates with this term the assembly which originated the Magna Charta 'Parliamentum Runcimede quod fuit inter Dom Joh. Regem patrem nostrum et barones suos Angliae' (Rot. Claus., 28 Hen. III.) The name 'parliament' now occurs more frequently, but does not supplant the more indefinite terms 'concluim' 'colloquium' etc.—R. Gneist, *Hist. of the English Const.* ch. 19 and foot note, 2a (v. 1).—The name given to these sessions of Council [the national councils of the 12th century] was often expressed by the Latin 'colloquium' and it is by no means unlikely that the name of Parliament which is used as early as 1175 by Jordan Fantosme may have been in common use. But of this we have no distinct instance in the Latin Chroniclers for some years further, although when the term comes into use it is applied retrospectively.—W. Stubbs, *Const. Hist. of Eng.* ch. 13, sect. 159.

A. D. 1258.—The Mad Parliament.—An English Parliament, or Great Council assembled at Oxford A.D. 1258, so called by the party of King Henry III from whom it extorted an important reorganization of the government, with much curtailment of the royal power.—W. Stubbs, *Const. Hist. of Eng.*, ch. 14, sect. 176 (v. 2)—See ENGLAND A.D. 1216-1274.

A. D. 1264.—Simon de Montfort's Parliament. See ENGLAND A.D. 1216-1274, and PARLIAMENT, THE ENGLISH EARLY STAGES IN ITS EVOLUTION.

A. D. 1275-1295.—Development under Edward I. See ENGLAND A.D. 1275-1295.

A. D. 1376.—The Good Parliament.—The English parliament of 1376 was called the Good Parliament, although most of the good work it undertook to do was undone by its successor.—W. Stubbs, *Const. Hist. of Eng.*, ch. 16 (v. 2).

A. D. 1388.—The Wonderful Parliament.—In 1387, King Richard II was compelled by a great armed demonstration, headed by five powerful nobles, to discard his obnoxious favorites and advisers, and to summon a Parliament for dealing with the offenses alleged against them. "The doings of this Parliament [which came together in February, 1388] are without a parallel in English history, —so much so that the name 'Wonderful Parliament' came afterwards to be applied to it. With equal truth it was also called 'the Merciless Parliament'." It was occupied for four months in the impeachment

PARLIAMENT.

and trial of ministers, judges, officers of the courts, and other persons, bringing a large number to the block.—J. Gardiner, *Houses of Lancaster and York*, ch. 2, sect. 5.

Also in: C. H. Pearson, *Eng. Hist. in the 14th Century*, ch. 11.

A. D. 1404.—The Unlearned Parliament.—"This assembly [A. D. 1404, reign of Edward IV] acquired its ominous name from the fact that in the writ of summons the king, acting upon the ordinance issued by Edward III in 1372, directed that no lawyers should be returned as members. He had complained more than once that the members of the House of Commons spent more time on private suits than on public business."—W. Stubbs, *Const. Hist. of Eng.*, ch. 18, sect. 634 (v. 3).

A. D. 1413-1422.—First acquisition of Privilege. See ENGLAND A.D. 1418-1422.

A. D. 1425.—The Parliament of Bats.—The English Parliament of 1425-1426 was so-called because of the quarrel in it between the parties of Duke Humphrey, of Gloucester, and of his uncle Bishop Beaufort.

A. D. 1471-1485.—Depression under the Yorkist kings. See ENGLAND A.D. 1471-1485.

A. D. 1558-1603.—Under Queen Elizabeth. See ENGLAND A.D. 1558-1603.

A. D. 1614.—The Addled Parliament.—In 1614 James I called a Parliament which certain obsequious members promised to manage for him and make docile to his royal will and pleasure. This fact leaked out and the angry Parliament was dissolved in haste before it had done any business. The humour of the time christened this futile Parliament 'The Addled Parliament'—J. F. Bright, *Hist. of Eng.*, Part 2, p. 599.

A. D. 1640.—The Short Parliament. See ENGLAND A.D. 1640.

A. D. 1640.—The Long Parliament. See ENGLAND A.D. 1640-1641.

A. D. 1641-1664.—Triennial Acts. In 1641 an act was passed which provided for the election of a Parliament in three years after any dissolution, if none should have been regularly summoned. In 1664 this act was repealed, but with a proviso that no Parliament should exist longer than three years.—G. B. Smith, *Hist. of Eng. Parl.*, ch. 2 (v. 1).

A. D. 1648.—The Rump. See ENGLAND: A.D. 1648 (NOVEMBER-DECEMBER).

A. D. 1649.—Temporary abolition of the House of Peers. See ENGLAND A.D. 1649 (FEBRUARY).

A. D. 1653.—The Barebones or Little Parliament. See ENGLAND A.D. 1653 (JUNE-DECEMBER).

A. D. 1659.—The Rump restored. See ENGLAND A.D. 1658-1660.

A. D. 1660-1740.—Rise and development of the Cabinet as an organ of Parliamentary government. See CABINET, THE ENGLISH.

A. D. 1693.—The Triennial Bill. In 1693, a bill which passed both Houses, despite the opposition of King William, provided that the Parliament then sitting should cease to exist on the next Lady Day, and that no future Parliament should last longer than three years. The king refused his assent to the enactment; but when a similar bill was passed the next year he suffered it to become a law.—H. Hallam, *Const. Hist. of Eng.*, ch. 15 (v. 3).

PARLIAMENT

A. D. 1703.—The Aylesbury election case. See ENGLAND A D 1703

A. D. 1707.—Becomes the Parliament of Great Britain.—Representation of Scotland. See SCOTLAND A D 1707

A. D. 1716.—The Septennial Act. See ENGLAND A D 1716

A. D. 1771.—Last struggle against the Press.—Freedom of reporting secured. See ENGLAND A D 1771

A. D. 1797.—Defeat of the first Reform measure. See ENGLAND A D 1797

A. D. 1830.—State of the unreformed representation. See ENGLAND A D 1830

A. D. 1832.—The first Reform of the Representation. See ENGLAND A D 1830-1832

A. D. 1867.—The second Reform Bill. See ENGLAND A D 1865-1868

A. D. 1883.—Act to prevent Corrupt and Illegal Practices at Elections. See ENGLAND A D 1883

A. D. 1884-1885.—The third Reform Bill (text and comment). See ENGLAND A D 1884-1885

PARLIAMENT, New Houses of. See WESTMINSTER PALACE

PARLIAMENT, The Scottish. See SCOTLAND A D 1326-1603

The Drunken. See SCOTLAND A D 1660-1666

PARLIAMENT OF FLORENCE. See FLORENCE A D 1250-1293

PARLIAMENT OF ITALIAN FREE CITIES. See ITALY A D 1056-1152

PARLIAMENT OF PARIS.—“When the Carlovingian Monarchy had given place first to Anarchy and then to Feudalism, the mallums and the Champs de Mai, and (except in some southern cities) the municipal curia also disappeared. But in their stead there came into existence the feudal courts. Each tenant in capite of the crown held within his fief a Parliament of his own free vassals. There was administered the seigneur's 'justice,' whether haute, moyenne, or basse. There were discussed all questions immediately affecting the seigneurie or the tenants of it. There especially were adopted all general regulations which the exigencies of the lordship were supposed to dictate, and especially all such as related to the raising of tailed or other imposts. What was thus done on a small scale in a minor fief, was also done, though on a larger scale, in each of the feudal provinces, and on a scale yet more extensive in the court or Parliament helden by the king as a seigneur of the royal domain. This royal court or Parliament was, however, not a Legislature in our modern sense of that word. It was rather a convention, in which, by a voluntary compact between the king as supreme suzerain and the greater seigneurs as his feudatories, an ordonance or an impost was established, either throughout the entire kingdom, or in some seigneuries apart from the rest. From any such compact any seigneur might dissent on behalf of himself and his immediate vassals or, by simply absenting himself, might render the extension of it to his own fief impossible. . . . Subject to the many corrections which would be requisite to reduce to perfect accuracy this slight sketch of

PARLIAMENT OF PARIS.

the origin of the great council or Parliament of the kings of France, such was, in substance, the constitution of it at the time of the accession of Louis IX [A D 1226]. Before the close of his eventful reign, that monarch had acquired the character and was in full exercise of the powers of a law giver and was habitually making laws, not with the advice and consent of his council or Parliament, but in the exercise of the inherent prerogative which even now they began to ascribe to the French crown. With our English prepossessions it is impossible to repress the wonder, and even the incredulity, with which we at first listen to the statement that the supreme judicial tribunal of the kingdom could be otherwise than the zealous and effectual antagonist of so momentous an encroachment.” The explanation is found in a change which had taken place in the character of the Parliament, through which its function and authority became distinctly judicial and quite apart from those of a council or a legislature. When Philip Augustus went to the Holy Land, he provided for the decision of complaints against officers of the crown by directing the queen mother and the archbishop of Rheims, who acted as regents, to hold an annual assembly of the greater barons. “This practice had become habitual by the time of Louis IX. For the confirmation and improvement of it that monarch ordered that before the day of any such assemblage, citations should be issued commanding the attendance not as before of the greater barons exclusively, but of twenty four members of the royal council or Parliament. Of those twenty four, three only were to be great barons three were to be bishops, and the remaining eighteen were to be knights. But as these members of the royal council did not appear to St. Louis to possess all the qualifications requisite for the right discharge of the judicial office, he directed that thirty seven other persons should be associated to them. Of those associates seventeen were to be clerks in holy orders and twenty légistes, that is, men bred to the study of the law. The function assigned to the légistes was that of drawing up in proper form the decesses and other written acts of the collective body. To this body, when thus constituted, was given the distinctive title of the Parliament of Paris.” By virtue of their superior education and training, the légistes soon gathered the business of the Parliament into their own hands, the knights and barons found attendance a bore and an absurdity. “Enui and ridicule . . . proved in the Parliament of Paris a purge quite as effectual as that which Colonel Pride administered to the English House of Commons. The conseiller clerics were soon left to themselves, in due time to found, and to enjoy, what began to be called ‘La Noblesse de la Robe’ [See FRANCE A. D. 1226-1270.] Having thus assumed the government of the court, the légistes next proceeded to enlarge its jurisdiction. . . . The Parliament had, in the beginning of the 14th century, become the supreme legal tribunal within the whole of that part of France which was at that time attached to the crown.” In the reign of Philip the Long (1266-1292) the Parliament and the royal council became practically distinct bodies: the former became sedentary at Paris, meeting nowhere else, and its members were required to be constantly resident in Paris. By 1345 the parliamentary

counselors, as they were now called, had acquired life appointments, and in the reign of Charles VI. (1380-1422) the seats in the Parliament of Paris became hereditary. "At the period when the Parliament of Paris was acquiring its peculiar character as a court of justice, the meetings of the great vassals of the crown, to co-operate with the king in legislation, were falling into disuse. The king . . . had begun to originate laws without their sanction, and the Parliament, not without some show of reason, assumed that the right of remonstrance, formerly enjoyed by the great vassals, had now passed to themselves. . . . If their remonstrance was disregarded, their next step was to request that the projected law might be withdrawn. If that request was unheeded, they at length formally declined to register it among their records. Such refusals were sometimes but were not usually successful. In most instances they provoked from the king a peremptory order for the immediate registration of his ordinance. To such orders the Parliament generally submitted"—Sir J. Stephen, *Lect's on the Hist. of France*, lect. 8—"It appears that the opinion is unfounded which ascribes to the States [the 'States-General'] and the Parliaments a different origin. Both arose out of the National Assemblies held at stated periods in the earliest times of the monarchy [the 'Champs de Mars' and 'Champs de Mai'] Certainly in the earliest part of [the 13th] century there existed no longer two bodies but only one, which had then acquired the name of Parliament. The stated meetings under the First race were called by the name of Mallum or Mallus, sometimes Placitum [also Plaid], sometimes Synod. Under the Second race they were called Colloquio also. The translation of this term (and it is said also of Mal lum) into Parliament occurs not before the time of Louis VI. (le Gros), but in that of Louis VIII., at the beginning of the 13th century, it became the usual appellation. There were then eleven Parliaments, besides that of Paris, and all those bodies had become merely judicial, that of Paris exercising a superintending power over the other tribunals. . . . After [1334] . . . the Parliament was only called upon to register the Ordinances. This gave a considerable influence to the Parliament of Paris, which had a right of remonstrance before registry, the Provincial Parliaments only could remonstrate after registry. . . . The Parliament of Paris, besides remonstrating, might refuse to register; and though compellable by the King holding a Bed of Justice, which was a more solemn meeting of the Parliament attended by the King's Court in great state [see BED OF JUSTICE], yet it cannot be doubted that many Ordinances were prevented and many modified in consequence of this power of refusal."—Lord Brougham, *Hist. of England and France under the House of Lancaster*, note 66.—For an account of the conflict between the Parliament of Paris and the crown which immediately preceded the French Revolution, see FRANCE: A. D. 1787-1789.

ALSO IN: M. de la Rocheterie, *Mario Antoinette*, ch. 6-11.

PARMA, Alexander Farnese, Duke of, in the Netherlands. See NETHERLANDS: A. D. 1577-1581, to 1588-1598.

PARMA, Founding of. See MUTINA.

A. D. 1077-1115.—In the Dominions of the Countess Matilda. See PAPACY: A. D. 1077-1102.

A. D. 1339-1349.—Bought by the Visconti, of Milan. See MILAN: A. D. 1277-1447.

A. D. 1513.—Conquest by Pope Julius II See ITALY: A. D. 1510-1513.

A. D. 1515.—Reannexed to Milanese and acquired by France. See FRANCE: A. D. 1515-1518.

A. D. 1521.—Retaken by the Pope. See FRANCE A. D. 1520-1523.

A. D. 1545-1592.—Alienation from the Holy See and erection, with Placentia, into a duchy, for the House of Farnese—"Paul III. was the last of those ambitious popes who rendered the interests of the holy see subordinate to the aggrandizement of their families. The designs of Paul, himself the representative of the noble Roman house of Farnese, were ultimately successful, since, although partially defeated during his life, they led to the establishment of his descendants on the throne of Parma and Placentia for nearly 200 years He gained the consent of the sacred college to alienate those states from the holy see in 1545, that he might erect them into a duchy for his natural son, Pietro Luigi Farnese, and the Emperor Charles V. had already, some years before, to secure the support of the papacy against France, bestowed the hand of his natural daughter, Margaret, widow of Alessandro de' Medici, upon Ottavio, son of Pietro Luigi, and grandson of Paul III. Notwithstanding this measure, Charles V. was not subsequently, however, the more disposed to confirm to the house of Farnese the investiture of their new possessions, which he claimed as part of the Milanese duchy; and he soon evinced no friendly disposition towards his own son in law, Ottavio. Pietro Luigi, the first duke of Parma, proved himself, by his extortions, his cruelties, and his debaucheries, scarcely less detestable than any of the ancient tyrants of Lombardy. He thus provoked a conspiracy and insurrection of the nobles of Placentia, where he resided, and he was assassinated by them at that place in 1547, after a reign of only two years. The city was immediately seized in the imperial name by Gonzaga, governor of Milan.

To deter the emperor from appropriating Parma also to himself, [Paul III.] could devise no other expedient than altogether to retract his grant from his family, and to reoccupy that city for the holy see, whose rights he conceived that the emperor would not venture to invade." But after the death of Paul III., the Farnese party, commanding a majority in the conclave, "by raising Julius III. to the tiara [1550], obtained the restitution of Parma to Ottavio from the gratitude of the new pope. The prosperity of the ducal house of Farnese was not yet securely established. The emperor still retained Placentia, and Julius III. soon forgot the services of that family. In 1551, the pope leagued with Charles V. to deprive the duke Ottavio of the fief which he had restored to him. Farnese was thus reduced . . . to place himself under the protection of the French; and this measure, and the indecisive war which followed, became his salvation. He still preserved his throne when Charles V. terminated his reign; and one of the first acts of Philip II., when Italy was menaced by the invasion of the duke de Guise [1559], was to win him

over from the French alliance, and to secure his gratitude, by yielding Placentia again to him. But a Spanish garrison was still left in the citadel of that place; and it was only the brilliant military career of Alessandro Farnese, the celebrated prince of Parma, son of duke Ottavio, which finally consummated the greatness of his family. Entering the service of Philip II., Alessandro gradually won the respect and favour of that gloomy monarch; and at length, in 1585, as a reward for his achievements, the Spanish troops were withdrawn from his father's territories. The duke Ottavio closed his life in the following year; but Alessandro never took possession of his throne. He died at the head of the Spanish armies in the Low Countries in 1592; and his son Ranuccio quietly commenced his reign over the duchy of Parma and Placentia under the double protection of the holy see and the monarchy of Spain."—G. Procter, *Hist. of Italy*, ch. 9.

A. D. 1635.—Alliance with France against Spain. See GERMANY: A. D. 1634-1639.

A. D. 1635-1637.—Desolation of the duchy by the Spaniards.—The French alliance renounced. See ITALY: A. D. 1635-1639.

A. D. 1725.—Reversion of the duchy pledged to the Infant of Spain. See SPAIN: A. D. 1713-1725.

A. D. 1731.—Possession given to Don Carlos, the Infant of Spain. See SPAIN: A. D. 1726-1731; and ITALY: A. D. 1715-1735.

A. D. 1735.—Restored to Austria. See FRANCE: A. D. 1733-1735; and ITALY: A. D. 1715-1735.

A. D. 1745-1748.—Changes of masters.—In the War of the Austrian Succession, Parma was taken by Spain in 1745; recovered by Austria in the following year (see ITALY: A. D. 1746-1747); but surrendered by Maria Theresa to the infant of Spain in 1748.

A. D. 1767.—Expulsion of the Jesuits.—Papal excommunication of the Duke. See JESUITS: A. D. 1761-1769.

A. D. 1801.—The Duke's son made King of Etruria. See GERMANY: A. D. 1801-1803.

A. D. 1802.—The duchy declared a dependency of France. See FRANCE: A. D. 1802 (AUGUST—SEPTEMBER).

A. D. 1814.—Duchy conferred on Marie Louise, the ex-empress of Napoleon. See FRANCE: A. D. 1814 (MARCH—APRIL).

A. D. 1831.—Revolt and expulsion of Marie Louise.—Her restoration by Austria. See ITALY: A. D. 1830-1832.

A. D. 1848-1849.—Abortive revolution. See ITALY: A. D. 1848-1849.

A. D. 1859-1861.—End of the duchy.—Absorption in the new kingdom of Italy. See ITALY: A. D. 1859-1859; and 1859-1861.

PARMA, Battle of (1734). See FRANCE: A. D. 1733-1735.

PARNASSUS. See THESSALY; and DORIANS AND IONIANS.

PARNELL MOVEMENT, The. See IRELAND: A. D. 1873-1879, to 1889-1891.

PARRIS, Samuel, and Salem Witchcraft. See MASSACHUSETTS: A. D. 1692.

PARSEES, The.—"On the western coast of India, from the Gulf of Cambay to Bombay, we find from one hundred to one hundred and fifty thousand families whose ancestors migrated thither from Iran. The tradition among them

is, that at the time when the Arabs, after conquering Iran and becoming sovereigns there, persecuted and eradicated the old religion [of the Avesta], faithful adherents of the creed fled to the mountains of Kerman. Driven from these by the Arabs (in Kerman and Yezd a few hundred families are still found who maintain the ancient faith), they retired to the island of Hormuz (a small island close by the southern coast, at the entrance to the Persian Gulf). From hence they migrated to Din (on the coast of Guzerat), and then passed over to the opposite shore. In the neighbourhood of Bombay and in the south of India inscriptions have been found which prove that these settlers reached the coast in the tenth century of our era. At the present time their descendants form a considerable part of the population of Surat, Bombay, and Ahmadabad; they call themselves, after their ancient home, Parsees, and speak the later Middle Persian."—M. Duncker, *Hist. of Antiquity*, bk. 7, ch. 2 (n. 5).—See, also, ZOROASTRIANS.

PARSONS' CAUSE, The. See VIRGINIA: A. D. 1763.

PARTHENII, The.—This name was given among the Spartans to a class of young men, sons of Spartan women who had married outside the exclusive circle of the Spartiate. The latter refused, even when Sparta was most pressingly in need of soldiers, to admit these "sons of maidens," as they stigmatized them, to the military body. The Parthenii, becoming numerous, were finally driven to emigrate, and found a home at Tarentum, Italy.—E. Curtius, *Hist. of Greece*, bk. 2, ch. 1.—See TARENTUM.

PARTHENON AT ATHENS, The.—

"Pericles had occasion to erect on the highest point of the Acropolis, in place of the ancient Hecatompedon, a new festive edifice and treasure-house, which, by blending intimately together the fulfilment of political and religious ends, was to serve to represent the piety and artistic culture, the wealth and the festive splendour—in fine, all the glories which Athens had achieved by her valour and her wisdom [see ATHENS: B. C. 445-431]. . . . The architect from whose design, sanctioned by Pericles and Phidias, the new Hecatompedon was erected, was Ictinus, who was seconded by Callicrates, the experienced architect of the double line of walls. It was not intended to build an edifice which should attract attention by the colossal nature of its proportions or the novelty of its style. The traditions of the earlier building were followed, and its dimensions were not exceeded by more than 50 feet. In a breadth of 100 feet the edifice extended in the form of a temple, 226 feet from east to west; and the height, from the lowest stair to the apex of the pediment, amounted only to 65 feet. . . . The Hecatompedon, or Parthenon (for it went by this name also as the house of Athene Parthenos), was very closely connected with the festival of the Panathenaea, whose splendour and dignity had gradually risen by degrees together with those of the state. . . . The festival commenced with the performances in the Odeum, where the masters of song and recitation, and the cither and flute-players, exhibited their skill, the choral songs being produced in the theatre. Hereupon followed the gymnastic games, which, besides the usual contests in the stadium, foot-race, wrestling-matches, &c., also included the

torch-race, which was held in the Ceramicus outside the Dipylum, when no moon shone in the heavens; and which formed one of the chief attractions of the whole festival."—E. Curtius, *Hist. of Greece, bk. 3, ch. 3*—See, also, ACROPOLIS OF ATHENS

A. D. 1687.—Destructive explosion during the siege of Athens by the Venetians. See TURKS. A. D. 1684–1696

PARTHENOPÉ. See NEAPOLIS AND PALÆOPOLIS

PARTHENOPEIAN REPUBLIC, The. See FRANCE. A. D. 1798–1799 (AUGUST—APRIL)

PARTHIA, AND THE PARTHIAN EMPIRE.—"The mountain chain, which running southward of the Caspian skirts the great plateau of Iran, or Persia, on the north, broadens out after it passes the south-eastern corner of the sea, into a valuable and productive mountain region. Four or five distinct ranges here run parallel to one another, having between them latitudinal valleys, with glens transverse to their courses. The sides of the valleys are often well wooded, the flat ground at the foot of the hills is fertile; water abounds, and the streams gradually collect into rivers of a considerable size. The fertile territory in this quarter is further increased by the extension of cultivation to a considerable distance from the base of the most southern of the ranges, in the direction of the Great Iranian desert. It was undoubtedly in the region which has been thus briefly described that the ancient home of the Parthians lay. Parthia Proper, however, was at no time coextensive with the region described. A portion of that region formed the district called Hyrcania, and it is not altogether easy to determine what were the limits between the two. The evidence goes, on the whole, to show that while Hyrcania lay towards the west and north, the Parthian country was that towards the south and east, the valleys of the Ettrek and Gurghan constituting the main portions of the former, while the tracts east and south of those valleys, as far as the sixty-first degree of E. longitude, constituted the latter. If the limits of Parthia Proper be thus defined, it will have nearly corresponded to the modern Persian province of Khorasan. The Turanian character of the Parthians, though not absolutely proved, appears to be in the highest degree probable. If it be accepted, we must regard them as in race closely allied to the vast hordes which from a remote antiquity have roamed over the steppe region of Upper Asia, from time to time bursting upon the south and harassing or subjugating the comparatively unwarlike inhabitants of the warmer countries. We must view them as the congeners of the Huns, Bulgarians and Comans of the ancient world, of the Kalmucks, Ouirgurs, Usbeqs, Eleuts, &c., of the present day. . . . The Parthians probably maintained their independence from the time of their settlement in the district called after their name until the sudden arrival in their country of the great Persian conqueror, Cyrus, [about 554 B. C.]. . . . When the Persian empire was organised by Darius Hystaspis into satrapies, Parthia was at first united in the same government with Chorasmia, Sogdiana and Aria. Subsequently, however, when satrapies were made more numerous, it was detached from these extensive countries, and made to form a

distinct government, with the mere addition of the comparatively small district of Hyrcania." The conquests of Alexander included Parthia within their range, and, under the new political arrangements which followed Alexander's death, that country became for a time part of the wide empire of the Seleucidae, founded by Seleucus Nicator, — the kingdom of Syria as it was called. But about 250 B. C. a successful revolt occurred in Parthia, led by one Arsaces, who founded an independent kingdom and a dynasty called the Arsacids (see SELEUCIDÆ. B. C. 281–224, and 224–187). Under succeeding kings, especially under the sixth of the line, Mithridates I (not to be confused with the Mithridatic dynasty in Pontus), the kingdom of Parthia was swollen by conquest to a great empire, covering almost the whole territory of the earlier Persian empire, excepting in Asia Minor and Syria. On the rise of the Roman power, the Parthians successfully disputed with it the domination of the east, in several wars (see ROME B. C. 57–52), none of which were advantageous to the Romans, until the time of Trajan.—G. Rawlinson, *Sixth Great Oriental Monarchy. Parthia*—Trajan (A. D. 115–117—see ROME A. D. 96–138) "undertook an expedition against the nations of the East.

The success of Trajan, however transient, was rapid and specious. The degenerate Parthians, broken by intestine discord, fled before his arms. He descended the river Tigris in triumph, from the mountains of Armenia to the Persian gulf. He enjoyed the honour of being the first, as he was the last, of the Roman generals who ever navigated that remote sea. His fleets ravaged the coasts of Arabia. Every day the astonished senate received the intelligence of new names and new nations that acknowledged his sway. But the death of Trajan soon clouded the splendid prospect. The resignation of all the eastern conquests of Trajan was the first measure of his [successor Hadrian's] reign. He [Hadrian] restored to the Parthians the election of an independent sovereign, withdrew the Roman garrisons from the provinces of Armenia, Mesopotamia and Assyria, and, in compliance with the precept of Augustus, once more established the Euphrates as the frontier of the empire.—E. Gibbon, *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire, ch. 1*—In the reign of Marcus Aurelius Antoninus at Rome, the Parthian king Vologeses III (or Arsaces XXVII) provoked the Roman power anew by invading Armenia and Syria. In the war which followed, the Parthians were driven from Syria and Armenia, Mesopotamia was occupied, Seleucia, Ctesiphon and Babylon taken, and the royal palace at Ctesiphon burned (A. D. 165). Parthia then sued for peace, and obtained it by ceding Mesopotamia, and allowing Armenia to return to the position of a Roman dependency. Half a century later the final conflict of Rome and Parthia occurred. "The battle of Nisibis [A. D. 217], which terminated the long contest between Rome and Parthia, was the fiercest and best contested which was ever fought between the rival powers. It lasted for the space of three days. . . . Macrinus [the Roman emperor, who commanded] took to flight among the first; and his hasty retreat discouraged his troops, who soon afterwards acknowledged themselves beaten and retired within the lines of their camp. Both armies had suffered severely. Herodian describes the heaps of dead as piled to

such a height that the manœuvres of the troops were impeded by them, and at last the two contending hosts could scarcely see one another. Both armies, therefore, desired peace." But the peace was purchased by Rome at a heavy price. After this, the Parthian monarchy was rapidly undermined by internal dissensions and corruptions, and in A. D. 226 it was overthrown by a revolt of the Persians, who claimed and secured again, after five centuries and a half of subjugation, their ancient leadership among the races of the East. The new Persian Empire, or Sasanian monarchy, was founded by Artaxerxes I. on the ruins of the Parthian throne.—G. Rawlinson, *The Sixth Great Oriental Monarchy*, ch. 8-21.

ALSO IN: The same, *Story of Parthia*.

PARTHIAN HORSE.—PARTHIAN ARROWS.—"Fleet and active coursers, with scarcely any caparison but a headstall and a single rein, were mounted by riders clad only in a tunic and trousers, and armed with nothing but a strong bow and a quiver full of arrows. A training begun in early boyhood made the rider almost one with his steed; and he could use his weapons with equal ease and effect whether his horse was stationary or at full gallop, and whether he was advancing towards or hurriedly retreating from his enemy. . . . It was his ordinary plan to keep constantly in motion when in the presence of an enemy, to gallop backwards and forwards, or round and round his square or column, . . . at a moderate interval plying it with his keen and barbed shafts."—G. Rawlinson, *Sixth Great Oriental Monarchy*, ch. 11.

PARTIES AND FACTIONS, POLITICAL AND POLITICO-RELIGIOUS.—**Abolitionists.** See *SLAVERY, NEGRO*: A. D. 1828-1832; and 1840-1847. . . . **Adullamites.** See *ENGLAND*: A. D. 1863-1868. . . . **Aggravadios.** See *SPAIN*: A. D. 1814-1827. . . . **American.** See *UNITED STATES OF AM.*: A. D. 1852. . . . **Ammoniti.** See *FLORENCE*: A. D. 1358. . . . **Anarchists.** See *ANARCHISTS*. . . . **Amilleros.** See *SPAIN*: A. D. 1814-1827. . . . **Anti-Corn-Law League.** See *TARIFF LEGISLATION (ENGLAND)*: A. D. 1836-1839; and 1845-1846. . . . **Anti-Federalists.** See *UNITED STATES OF AM.*: A. D. 1789-1792. . . . **Anti-Masonic.** See *NEW YORK*: A. D. 1826-1832; and *MEXICO*: A. D. 1822-1828. . . . **Anti-Renters.** See *LIVINGSTON MANOR*. . . . **Anti-Semites.** See *JEWS: 19TH CENTURY*. . . . **Anti-Slavery.** See *SLAVERY, NEGRO*: A. D. 1688-1780; 1776-1808; 1828-1832; 1840-1847. . . . **Armagnacs.** See *FRANCE*: A. D. 1380-1415; and 1415-1419. . . . **Arrabiati.** See *FLORANCE*: A. D. 1490-1498. . . . **Assideans.** See *CHASIDIM*. . . . **Barnburners.** See *UNITED STATES OF AM.*: A. D. 1845-1846. . . . **Beggars.** See below: *GUEUX*. . . . **Bianchi.** See *FLORENCE*: A. D. 1295-1300; and 1301-1313. . . . **Bigi, or Greys.** See *Bigi*. . . . **Blacks, or Black Guelphs.** See *FLORENCE*: A. D. 1295-1300; and 1301-1313. . . . **Blue-Light Federalists.** See *BLUE-LIGHT FEDERALISTS*. . . . **Blues.** See *CIRCUS, FACTIONS OF THE ROMAN*; and *VENEZUELA*: 1829-1866. . . . **Border Ruffians.** See *KANSAS*: A. D. 1854-1859. . . . **Boys in Blue.** See *BOYS IN BLUE*. . . . **Bucktails.** See *NEW YORK*: A. D. 1817-1819. . . . **Bundschnuh.** See *GERMANY*: A. D. 1492-1514. . . . **Burgundians.** See *FRANCE*: A. D. 1395-1415; and 1415-1419. . . . **Burschenschaft.** See *GERMANY*: A. D. 1817-1820. . . . **Butternuts.** See *BOYS IN BLUE*. . . . **Cabochiana.** See

FRANCE: A. D. 1380-1415. . . . **Calixtines, or Utraquists.** See *BOHEMIA*: A. D. 1419-1484; and 1484-1457. . . . **Camisards.** See *FRANCE*: A. D. 1702-1710. . . . **Caps and Hats.** See below: *HATS AND CAPS*. . . . **Carbonari.** See *ITALY*: A. D. 1808-1809. . . . **Carlists.** See *SPAIN*: A. D. 1833-1846; and 1873-1885. . . . **Carpet-baggers.** See *UNITED STATES OF AM.*: A. D. 1866-1871. . . . **Cavaliers and Roundheads.** See *ENGLAND*: A. D. 1641 (OCTOBER); also, *Roundheads*. . . . **Center.** See *RIGHT, LEFT, and CENTER*. . . . **Charcoals.** See *CLAYBANKS AND CHARCOALS*. . . . **Chartists.** See *ENGLAND*: A. D. 1838-1842; and 1848. . . . **Chasidim.** See *CHASIDIM*. . . . **Chouans.** See *FRANCE*: A. D. 1794-1796. . . . **Christinos.** See *SPAIN*: A. D. 1833-1846; and 1873-1885. . . . **Claybanks and Charcoals.** See *CLAYBANKS AND CHARCOALS*. . . . **Clear Grits.** See *CANADA*: A. D. 1840-1867. . . . **Clichyans.** See *FRANCE*: A. D. 1797 (SEPTEMBER). . . . **Clintonians.** See *NEW YORK*: A. D. 1817-1819. . . . **Cods.** See below: *Hooks and Cods*. . . . **Communeros.** See *SPAIN*: A. D. 1814-1827. . . . **Communists.** See *FRANCE*: A. D. 1871 (MARCH—MAY). . . . **Conservative (English).** See *CONSERVATIVE PARTY*. . . . **Constitutional Union.** See *UNITED STATES OF AM.*: A. D. 1860 (APRIL—NOVEMBER). . . . **Copperheads.** See *COPPERHEADS*. . . . **Cordeliers.** See *FRANCE*: A. D. 1790. . . . **Country Party.** See *ENGLAND*: A. D. 1872-1873. . . . **Covenanters.** See *COVENANTERS*; also *SCOTLAND*: A. D. 1557, 1581, 1638, 1644-1645, and 1660-1661, to 1681-1689. . . . **Crétois.** See *FRANCE*: A. D. 1795 (APRIL). . . . **Decamisados.** See *SPAIN*: A. D. 1814-1827. . . . **Democrats.** See *UNITED STATES OF AM.*: A. D. 1789-1792; 1825-1828; 1845-1846. . . . **Doughfaces.** See *DOUGHFACES*. . . . **Douglas Democrats.** See *UNITED STATES OF AM.*: A. D. 1860 (APRIL—NOVEMBER). . . . **Equal Rights Party.** See *NEW YORK*: A. D. 1835-1837. . . . **Escocés.** See *MEXICO*: A. D. 1822-1828. . . . **Essex Junto.** See *ESSEX JUNTO*. . . . **Farmers' Alliance.** See *UNITED STATES OF AM.*: A. D. 1877-1891. . . . **Federalists.** See *UNITED STATES OF AM.*: A. D. 1789-1792; 1812; and 1814 (DECEMBER) *THE HARTFORD CONVENTION*. . . . **Feds.** See *BOYS IN BLUE*. . . . **Fenians.** See *IRELAND*: A. D. 1858-1867; and *CANADA*: A. D. 1866-1871. . . . **Feuillants.** See *FRANCE*: A. D. 1790. . . . **Free Soilers.** See *UNITED STATES OF AM.*: A. D. 1848. . . . **Free Traders.** See *TARIFF LEGISLATION*. . . . **The Fronde.** See *FRANCE*: A. D. 1649, to 1651-1653. . . . **Gachupines.** See *GACHUPINES*. . . . **Girondists.** See *FRANCE*: A. D. 1791 (OCTOBER), to 1793-1794 (OCTOBER—APRIL). . . . **Gomerists.** See *NETHERLANDS*: A. D. 1603-1619. . . . **Grafters.** See *UNITED STATES OF AM.*: A. D. 1877-1891. . . . **Graybacks.** See *BOYS IN BLUE*. . . . **Greenbackers.** See *UNITED STATES OF AM.*: A. D. 1880. . . . **Greens.** See *CIRCUS, FACTIONS OF THE ROMAN*. . . . **Greys.** See *Bigi*. . . . **Guadalupes.** See *GACHUPINES*. . . . **Guelphs and Ghibellines.** See *GUELFS*. . . . **Gueux, or Beggars.** See *NETHERLANDS*: A. D. 1362-1366. . . . **Half-breeds.** See *STALWARTS*. . . . **Hard-Shell Democrats.** See *UNITED STATES OF AM.*: A. D. 1845-1846. . . . **Hats and Caps.** See *SCANDINAVIAN STATES (SWEDEN)*: A. D. 1790-1793. . . . **Home Rulers or Nationalists.** See *IRELAND*: A. D. 1878-1879; also *ENGLAND*: A. D. 1885-1886, and 1892-1893. . . . **Hoods and Ceds, or Kabelljanwa.** See *NETHERLANDS*.

(HOLLAND): A. D. 1845-1854; and 1482-1493. **Huguenots.** See FRANCE: A. D. 1559-1561, to 1598-1599; 1620-1622, to 1627-1628; 1661-1680; 1881-1898; 1702-1710. **Hunkers.** See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1845-1846. **Iconoclasts of the 8th century.** See ICONOCLASTIC CONTROVERSY. **Iconoclasts of the 16th century.** See NETHERLANDS: A. D. 1566-1568. **Importants.** See FRANCE: A. D. 1642-1643. **Independent Republicans.** See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1884. **Independents, or Separatists.** See INDEPENDENTS. **Intransigentists.** See INTRANSIGENTISTS. **Irredentists.** See IRREDENTISTS. **Jacobins.** See FRANCE: A. D. 1790, to 1794-1795 (JULY-APRIL). **Jacobites.** See JACOBITES. **Jacquerie.** See FRANCE: A. D. 1358. **Jingoes.** See TURKS: A. D. 1878. **Kabeljauws.** See above: HOOKS AND CODS. **Kharejites.** See KHAREJITES. **Know Nothing.** See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1852. **Ku Klux Klan.** See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1866-1871. **Land Leaguers.** See IRELAND: A. D. 1873-1879. **Left.—Left Center.** See RIGHT, LEFT, AND CENTER. **Legitimists.** See LEGITIMISTS. **Leliaards.** See LELIAERDS. **Levelers.** See LEVELLERS. **Liberal Republicans.** See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1872. **Liberal Unionists.** See ENGLAND: A. D. 1885-1886. **Libertines.** See LIBERTINES OF GENEVA. **Liberty Boys.** See below: SONS OF LIBERTY. **Liberty Party.** See SLAVERY, NEGRO: A. D. 1840-1847. **Locofocos.** See LOCOFOCOS; and NEW YORK: A. D. 1835-1837. **Lollards.** See ENGLAND: A. D. 1360-1414. **Malignants.** See MALIGNANTS. **The Marais, or Plain.** See FRANCE: A. D. 1792 (SEPTEMBER—NOVEMBER). **Marians.** See ROME: B. C. 88-78. **Martling Men.** See MARTLING MEN. **Melchites.** See MELCHITES. **The Mountain.** See FRANCE: A. D. 1791 (OCTOBER); 1792 (SEPTEMBER—NOVEMBER); and after, to 1794-1795 (JULY-APRIL). **Mugwumps.** See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1884. **Muscadins.** See FRANCE: A. D. 1794-1795 (JULY-APRIL). **Nationalists, Irish.** See ENGLAND: A. D. 1885-1886. **Neri.** See FLORENCE: A. D. 1295-1300; and 1301-1318. **Nihilists.** See NIHILISM. **Oak Boys.** See IRELAND: A. D. 1700-1798. **Opportunists.** See FRANCE: A. D. 1893. **Orangemen.** See IRELAND: A. D. 1795-1796. **Orleanists.** See LEGITIMISTS. **The Ormée.** See BORDEAUX: A. D. 1652-1653. **Orphans.** See BOHEMIA: A. D. 1419-1434. **Ottimati.** See FLORENCE: A. D. 1498-1500. **Palleschi.** See FLORENCE: A. D. 1498-1500. **Patrons of Husbandry.** See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1877-1891. **Peep-o'-Day Boys.** See IRELAND: A. D. 1780-1798, and 1784. **Pelucones.** See PELOCONES. **Petits Maitres.** See FRANCE: A. D. 1650-1651. **Piagnoni.** See FLORENCE: A. D. 1490-1498. **The Plain.** See FRANCE: A. D. 1792 (SEPTEMBER—NOVEMBER). **Plebs.** See PLEBEIANS; also, ROME: THE BEGINNING, and after. **Politiques.** See FRANCE: A. D. 1573-1576. **Popolani.** See FLORENCE: A. D. 1498-1500. **Populist or People's.** See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1892. **Prohibitionists.** See PROHIBITIONISTS. **Protectionists.** See TARIFF LEGISLATION. **Puritan.** See PURITANS. **Republican (Earlier).** See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1825-1828. **(Later).** See

UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1854-1855. **Ribbonmen.** See IRELAND: A. D. 1820-1826. **Right.—Right Center.** See RIGHT, LEFT, AND CENTER. **Roundheads.** See ENGLAND: A. D. 1641 (OCTOBER); also, ROUNDHEADS. **Sansculottes.** See FRANCE: A. D. 1791 (OCTOBER). **Secesh.** See BOYS IN BLUE. **Serviles.** See SPAIN: A. D. 1814-1827. **Shias.** See ISLAM. **Silver-greys, or Snuff-takers.** See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1850. **Socialists.** See SOCIAL MOVEMENTS. **Soft-Shell Democrats.** See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1845-1846. **Sons of Liberty.** See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1765 THE ORGANIZATION OF THE SONS OF LIBERTY, and 1864 (OCTOBER). **Stalwarts.** See STALWARTS. **Steel Boys.** See IRELAND: A. D. 1760-1798. **Sunni.** See ISLAM. **Taborites.** See BOHEMIA: A. D. 1419-1434; and 1434-1457. **Tammany Ring.** See NEW YORK: A. D. 1863-1871; and TAMMANY SOCIETY. **Tories.** See RAPPAREES; ENGLAND: A. D. 1680; CONSERVATIVE PARTY; and TORIES OF THE AM. REVOLUTION. **Tugenbund.** See GERMANY: A. D. 1808 (APRIL—DECEMBER). **Ultramontanists.** See ULTRAMONTANE. **United Irishmen.** See IRELAND: A. D. 1793-1798. **Utratists.** See BOHEMIA: A. D. 1419-1434; and 1434-1457. **Whigs (American).** See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1834. **Whigs (English).** See WHIGS. **Whiteboys.** See IRELAND: A. D. 1760-1798. **White Hoods.** See FLANDERS: A. D. 1379, and WHITE HOODS OF FRANCE. **Whites.** See FLORENCE: A. D. 1295-1300; and 1301-1313. **Wide Awakes.** See WIDE AWAKES. **Woolly-heads.** See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1850. **Yellows.** See VENEZUELA: A. D. 1829-1886. **Yorkinos.** See MEXICO: A. D. 1822-1828. **Young Ireland.** See IRELAND: A. D. 1841-1848. **Young Italy.** See ITALY: A. D. 1831-1848. **Zealots.** See ZEALOTS; and JEWS: A. D. 66-70.

PARTITION OF THE SPANISH EMPIRE, The Treaties of. See SPAIN: A. D. 1698-1700.

PARTITIONS OF POLAND. See POLAND: A. D. 1763-1773; and 1793-1796.

PARU, The Great. See EL DORADO.

PASARGADÆ.—One of the tribes of the ancient Persians, from which came the royal race of the Achaemenids.

PASCAGOULAS, The. See AMERICAN ABORIGINES: MUSKHOGEAN FAMILY.

PASCAL I., Pope, A. D. 817-824. PASCAL II., Pope, 1089-1118.

PASCUA. See VECTIGAL.

PASSAMAQUODDIES, The. A division of the Indian tribe of the Abnakis was so called.

PASSAROWITZ, Peace of (1718). See HUNGARY: A. D. 1699-1718.

PASSAU: Taken by the Bavarians and French. See GERMANY: A. D. 1703.

PASSAU, Treaty of. See GERMANY: A. D. 1546-1552.

PASSE, The. See AMERICAN ABORIGINES: GUIC OR COCO GROUP.

PASTEUR, Louis, and his work in Bacteriology. See MEDICAL SCIENCE: 19TH CENTURY.

PASTORS, The Crusade of the. See CRUSADES: A. D. 1252.

PASTRENGO, Battle of (1799). See FRANCE: A. D. 1798-1799 (AUGUST-APRIL).

PAstry WAR, The. See MEXICO A.D. 1828-1844.

PATAGONIANS, The. See AMERICAN ABORIGINES: PATAGONIANS.

PATARA, Oracle of. See ORACLES OF THE GREEKS.

PATARENES.—PATERINI.—About the middle of the 11th century, there appeared at Milan a young priest named Ariald who caused a great commotion by attacking the corruption of clergy and people and preaching repentance and reform. The whole of Milan became "separated into two hotly contending parties. This controversy divided families, it was the one object which commanded universal participation. The popular party, devoted to Ariald and Landulph [a deacon who supported Ariald], was nicknamed 'Pataria', which in the dialect of Milan signified a popular faction, and as a heretical tendency might easily grow out of, or attach itself to, this spirit of separatism so zealously opposed to the corruption of the clergy, it came about that, in the following centuries, the name Patarenes was applied in Italy as a general appellation to denote sects contending against the dominant church and clergy—sects which, for the most part, met with great favour from the people"—A Neander, *General Hist of the Christian Religion and Church* (Bohn's ed.), v. 6, p. 67.—"The name Patarini is derived from the quarter of the rag gatherers, Pataria"—W. Moeller, *Hist of the Christian Church in the Middle Ages*, p. 253, foot note.—During the fierce controversy of the 11th century over the question of celibacy for the clergy (see PAPACY A.D. 1058-1122), the party in Milan which supported Pope Gregory VII. (Hildebrand) in his inflexible warfare against the marriage of priests were called by their opponents Patarienes—H. H. Milman, *Hist of Latin Christianity*, bk. 6, ch. 3—See, also, CATHARISTS, ALBIGENSES; and PAULICIANS; and TURKS A.D. 1402-1451.

PATAVIVM, Early knowledge of. See VENETI OF CISALPINE GAUL.

PATAY, Battle of (1429). See FRANCE A.D. 1429-1431.

PATCHINAKS.—UZES.—COMANS.—The Patchinaks, or Patzinaks, Uzes and Comans were successive swarms of Turkish nomads which came into southeastern Europe during the 10th, 11th and 12th centuries, following and driving each other into the long and often devastated Danubian provinces of the Byzantine empire, and across the Balkans. The Comans are said to have been Turcomans with the first part of their true name dropped off—E. Pears, *The Fall of Constantinople*, ch. 3—See, also, RUSSIANS: A.D. 865-900.

PATENT RIGHT. See LAW, EQUITY: A.D. 1875.

PATER PATRIÆ.—"The first individual, belonging to an epoch strictly historical, who received this title was Cicero, to whom it was voted by the Senate after the suppression of the Catilinarian conspiracy."—W. Ramsay, *Manual of Roman Antiq.*, ch. 5.

PATERINI, The. See PATARENES.

PATNA, Massacre at (1763). See INDIA: A.D. 1757-1772.

PATRIARCH OF THE WEST, The.—"It was not long after the dissolution of the Jewish state [consequent on the revolt suppressed by Titus] that it revived again in ap-

pearance, under the form of two separate communities mostly dependent upon each other: one under a sovereignty purely spiritual, the other partly temporal and partly spiritual,—but each comprehending all the Jewish families in the two great divisions of the world. At the head of the Jews on this side of the Euphrates appeared the Patriarch of the West; the chief of the Mesopotamian community assumed the striking but more temporal title of 'Resch-Glutha,' or Prince of the Captivity. The origin of both these dignities, especially of the Western patriarchate, is involved in much obscurity"—H. H. Milman, *Hist of the Jews*, bk. 18.—See, also, JEWS: A.D. 200-400.

PATRIARCHS. See PRIMATES.

PATRICIAN, The class. See COMITIA CURIATA; also, PLEBEIANS.

PATRICIAN, The Later Roman Title.—

"Introduced by Constantine at a time when its original meaning had been long forgotten, it was designed to be, and for a while remained, the name not of an office but of a rank, the highest after those of emperor and consul. As such, it was usually conferred upon provincial governors of the first class, and in time also upon barbarian potentates whose vanity the Roman court might wish to flatter. Thus Odoacer, Theodoric, the Burgundian king Sigismund, Clovis himself, had all received it from the Eastern emperor, so too in still later times it was given to Saracen and Bulgarian princes. In the sixth and seventh centuries an invariable practice seems to have attached it to the Byzantine viceroys of Italy, and thus as we may conjecture, a natural confusion of ideas had made men take it to be, in some sense, an official title, conveying an extensive though undefined authority, and implying in particular the duty of overseeing the Church and promoting her temporal interests. It was doubtless with such a meaning that the Romans and their bishop bestowed it upon the Frankish kings, acting quite without legal right, for it could emanate from the emperor alone, but choosing it as the title which bound its possessor to render to the church support and defence against her Lombard foes"—J. Bryce, *The Holy Roman Empire*, ch. 4.

PATRICK, St., in Ireland. See IRELAND: 5-8TH CENTURIES, and EDUCATION, MEDIEVAL: IRELAND.

PATRIMONY OF ST. PETER, The.—The territory over which the Pope formerly exercised and still claims temporal sovereignty. See STATES OF THE CHURCH; also, PAPACY: A.D. 755-774, and after.

PATRIOT WAR, The. See CANADA: A.D. 1837-1838.

PATRIPASSIANS. See NOETIANS.

PATRONAGE, Political. See STALWARTS.

PATRONS OF HUSBANDRY. See UNITED STATES OF AM: A.D. 1877-1891; and SOCIAL MOVEMENTS: A.D. 1868-1875.

PATROONS OF NEW NETHERLAND. See NEW YORK: A.D. 1621-1646.

PATZINAKS, The. See PATCHINAKS.

PAUL, St., the Apostle, the missionary labors of. See CHRISTIANITY: A.D. 88-100; and ATHENS: B.C. 54 (?). . . . Paul, Czar of Russia, A.D. 1796-1801. . . . Paul I., Pope, 757-767. . . . Paul II., Pope, 1464-1471. . . . Paul III., Pope, 1534-1549. . . . Paul IV., Pope, 1555-1559. . . . Paul V., Pope, 1605-1621.

PAULETTE, The. See FRANCE: A. D. 1647-1648.

PAULICIANS, The.—"After a pretty long obscurity the Manichean theory revived with some modification in the western parts of Armenia, and was propagated in the 8th and 9th centuries by a sect denominated Paulicians. Their tenets are not to be collected with absolute certainty from the mouths of their adversaries, and no apology of their own survives. There seems however to be sufficient evidence that the Paulicians, though professing to acknowledge and even to study the apostolical writings, ascribed the creation of the world to an evil deity, whom they supposed also to be the author of the Jewish law, and consequently rejected all the Old Testament. . . . Petrus Siculus enumerates six Paulician heresies. 1. They maintained the existence of two deities, the one evil, and the creator of this world; the other good, . . . the author of that which is to come. 2. They refused to worship the Virgin, and asserted that Christ brought his body from heaven. 3. They rejected the Lord's Supper. 4. And the adoration of the cross. 5. They denied the authority of the Old Testament, but admitted the New, except the epistles of St Peter, and, perhaps, the Apocalypse. 6. They did not acknowledge the order of priests. There seems every reason to suppose that the Paulicians, notwithstanding their mistakes, were endowed with sincere and zealous piety, and studious of the Scriptures. . . . These errors exposed them to a long and cruel persecution, during which a colony of exiles was planted by one of the Greek emperors in Bulgaria. From this settlement they silently promulgated their Manichean creed over the western regions of Christendom. A large part of the commerce of those countries with Constantinople was carried on for several centuries by the channel of the Danube. This opened an immediate intercourse with the Paulicians, who may be traced up that river through Hungary and Bavaria, or sometimes taking the route of Lombardy, into Switzerland and France. In the last country, and especially in its southern and eastern provinces, they became conspicuous under a variety of names; such as Catharists, Picards, Paterins, but, above all, Albigenses. It is beyond a doubt that many of these sectaries owed their origin to the Paulicians; the appellation of Bulgarians was distinctively bestowed upon them; and, according to some writers, they acknowledged a primate or patriarch resident in that country. . . . It is generally agreed that the Manicheans from Bulgaria did not penetrate into the west of Europe before the year 1000; and they seem to have been in small numbers till about 1140. . . . I will only add, in order to obviate cavilling, that I use the word Albigenses for the Manichean sects, without pretending to assert that their doctrines prevailed more in the neighbourhood of Albi than elsewhere. The main position is that a large part of the Languedocian heretics against whom the crusade was directed had imbibed the Paulician opinions. If any one chooses rather to call them Catharists, it will not be material."—H. Hallam, *Middle Ages*, ch. 9, pt. 2, and foot notes.

Also in: E. Gibbon, *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, ch. 54.—See, also, CATHARISTS, and ALBIGENSES.

PAULINES, The. See BARNABITES.

PAULISTAS (of Brazil). See BRAZIL: A. D. 1581-1641.

PAULUS HOOK, The storming of. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1778-1779.

PAUMOTAS, The. See POLYNESIA.

PAUSANIAS. See GREECE: B. C. 478-477.

PAVIA: Origin of the city. See LIGURIANS: A. D. 270.—Defeat of the Alemanni. See ALEMANNI: A. D. 270.

A. D. 493-523.—Residence of Theodosius the Ostrogoth. See VERONA: A. D. 493-525.

A. D. 568-571.—Siege by the Lombards.—Made capital of the Lombard kingdom. See LOMBARDI: A. D. 568-573.

A. D. 753-754.—Siege by Charlemagne. See LOMBARDI: A. D. 754-774.

A. D. 924.—Destruction by the Hungarians. See ITALY: A. D. 900-924.

A. D. 1004.—Burned by the German troops. See ITALY: A. D. 961-1039.

11-12th Centuries.—Acquisition of Republics and Independence. See ITALY: A. D. 1056-1152.

A. D. 1395.—Relation to the duchy of the Visconti of Milan. See MILAN: A. D. 1277-1447.

A. D. 1524-1525.—Siege and Battle.—Defeat and capture of Francis I., of France. See FRANCE: A. D. 1523-1525.

A. D. 1527.—Taken and plundered by the French. See ITALY: A. D. 1527-1529.

A. D. 1745.—Taken by the French and Spaniards. See ITALY: A. D. 1745.

A. D. 1796.—Capture and pillage by the French. See FRANCE: A. D. 1796 (APRIL-OCTOBER).

PAVON, Battle of. See ARGENTINE REPUBLIC: A. D. 1819-1874.

PAVONIA, The Patroon colony of. See NEW YORK: A. D. 1621-1646.

PAWNEES, The. See AMERICAN ABORIGINES: PAWNEE ('ADDOAN) FAMILY.

PAWTUCKET INDIANS, The. See AMERICAN ABORIGINES: ALGONQUIAN FAMILY.

PAXTON BOYS, Massacre of Indians by the. See AMERICAN ABORIGINES: SUSQUEHANNAS.

PAYAGUAS, The. See AMERICAN ABORIGINES: PAMPAS TRIBES.

PAYENS, Hugh de, and the founding of the Order of the Templars. See TEMPLARS.

PAYTITI, The Great. See EL DORADO.

PAZZI, Conspiracy of the. See FLORENCE: A. D. 1469-1492.

PEA INDIANS, The. See AMERICAN ABORIGINES: ALGONQUIAN FAMILY.

PEA RIDGE, Battle of. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1862 (JANUARY-MARCH: MISSOURI-ARKANSAS).

PEABODY EDUCATION FUND. See EDUCATION, MODERN: AMERICA: A. D. 1867-1891.

PEACE, The King's. See KING'S PEACE; also LAW, COMMON: A. D. 871-1066, 1110, 1135, and 1300.

PEACE CONVENTION; The. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1861 (FEBRUARY).

PEACE OF AUGUSTUS, AND PEACE OF VESPASIAN. See TEMPLE OF JANUS.

PEACE OF THE DAMES, OR THE LADIES' PEACE. See ITALY: A. D. 1527-1529.

PEACH TREE CREEK

PEACH TREE CREEK, Battle of. See UNITED STATES OF AM A D 1864 (MAY—SEPTEMBER GEORGIA)

PEACOCK THRONE, The. See INDIA A D 1662-1748

PEAGE, OR PEAKE. See WAMPUM

PEASANT REVOLTS: A. D. 287.—The Bagauds of Gaul. See BAGAUDS

A. D. 1358.—The Jacquerie of France. See FRANCE A D 1358

A. D. 1381.—Wat Tyler's rebellion in England. See ENGLAND A D 1381

A. D. 1450.—Jack Cade's rebellion in England. See ENGLAND A D 1450

A. D. 1492-1514.—The Bundschuh in Germany. See GERMANY A D 1492-1514

A. D. 1513.—The Kurucs of Hungary. See HUNGARY A D 1487-1526

A. D. 1524-1525.—The Peasants' War in Germany. See GERMANY A D 1524-1525

A. D. 1652-1653.—Peasant War in Switzerland. See SWITZERLAND A D 1652-1789

PEC-SÆTAN.—Band of Angles who settled on the moorlands of the Peak of Derbyshire

PEDDAR-WAY, The.—The popular name of an old Roman road in England which runs from Bricaster, on the Wash, via Colchester, to London

PEDLÆI.—THE PEDION. See ATHENS B C 594

PEDRO (called The Cruel), King of Leon and Castile, A D 1350-1369 Pedro, King of Portugal, 1377-1367 Pedro I, Emperor of Brazil, 1822-1831 IV, King of Portugal, 1826

Pedro II., Emperor of Brazil, 1831-1849

Pedro II., King of Portugal, 1867-1706

Pedro III., King-Consort of Portugal, 1777-1786 Pedro V, King of Portugal, 1853-1861 Pedro. See also PETER

PEEL, Sir Robert: Administrations of See ENGLAND A D 1834-1837 1837-1839, 1841-1842, to 1846, TARIFF LEGISLATION (ENGLAND) A D 1842, and 1845-1846, MONEY AND BANKING A D 1844

PEEP-O'DAY BOYS. See IRELAND A D 1760-1798, and 1784

PEERS.—PEERAGE, The British.—“The estate of the peerage is identical with the house of lords”—W Stubbs *Const Hist of Eng*, v 2, p 184—See LORDS, BRITISH HOUSE OF, and PARLIAMENT, THE ENGLISH

PEERS OF FRANCE, The Twelve. See TWELVE PEERS OF FRANCE

PEGU, British acquisition of. See INDIA A D 1852

PEHLEVI LANGUAGE.—“Under the Arsacids the Old Persian passed into Middle Persian, which at a later time was known by the name of the Parthians, the tribe at that time supreme in Persia. Pahlav and Pehlevi mean Parthian, and, as applied to language, the language of the Parthians, i.e. of the Parthian era . . . In the latest period of the dominion of the Sassanids, the recent Middle Persian or Parsee took the place of Pehlevi”—M. Duncker, *Hist. of Antiquity*, bk 7, ch 1

PEHUELCHES, The. See AMERICAN ABorigines. PAMPAS TRIBES

PEKIN: The origin of the city. See CHINA: A. D. 1259-1294

PELASGIANS.

A. D. 1860.—English and French forces in the city.—The burning of the Summer Palace. See CHINA A D 1856-1860

PELAGIANISM.—“Pelagianism was . . . the great intellectual controversy of the church in the fifth century, as Arianism had been in the fourth . . . Every one is aware that this controversy turned upon the question of free-will and of grace, that is to say, of the relations between the liberty of man and the Divine power, of the influence of God upon the moral activity of men

About the year 405, a British monk, Pelagius (this is the name given him by the Greek and Latin writers, his real name, it appears, was Morgan), was residing at Rome. There has been infinite discussion as to his origin, his moral character, his capacity, his learning, and, under these various heads, much abuse has been lavished upon him, but this abuse would appear to be unfounded, for judging from the most authoritative testimony from that of St Augustin himself, Pelagius was a man of good birth, of excellent education of pure life. A resident, as I have said, at Rome, and now a man of mature age without laying down any distinct doctrines, without having written any book on the subject, Pelagius began about the year I have mentioned, 405, to talk much about free will to insist urgently upon this moral fact to expound it. There is no indication that he attacked any person about the matter or that he sought controversy. He appears to have acted simply upon the belief that man in liberty was not held in sufficient account, had not its due share in the religious doctrines of the period. These ideas excited no trouble in Rome, scarcely any debate. Pelagius spoke freely, they listened to him quietly. His principal disciple was Celestius, like him a monk or so it is thought at least, but younger.

In 411 Pelagius and Celestius are no longer at Rome, we find them in Africa, at Hippo and at Carthage. Their doctrines spread.

The bishop of Hippo began to be alarmed, he saw in these new ideas error and peril.

Saint Augustin was the chief of the doctors of the church called upon more than any other to maintain the general system of her doctrines.

You see from that time, what a serious aspect the quarrel took, everything was engaged in it, philosophy, politics, and religion, the opinions of Saint Augustin and his business, his self love and his duty. He entirely abandoned himself to it.

In the end, Saint Augustin and his opinions prevailed. The doctrines of Pelagius were condemned by three successive councils of the church, by three successive emperors and by two popes—one of whom was forced to reverse his first decision. His partisans were persecuted and banished.

“After the year 418, we discover in history no trace of Pelagius. The name of Celestius is sometimes met with until the year 427, it then disappears. These two men once off the scene, their school rapidly declined.”—F. Guizot, *Hist. of Civilisation* (trans. by Hazlitt), v 2, lect 5.

ALSO IN. P. Schaff, *Hist. of the Christian Church*, period 3, ch. 9.—See, also, POAT ROYAL AND THE JANSSENISTS.

PELASGIANS, The.—Under this name we have vague knowledge of a people whom the Greeks of historic times refer to as having preceded them in the occupancy of the Hellespont

peninsula and Asia Minor, and whom they looked upon as being kindred to themselves in race. "Such information as the Hellenes . . . possessed about the Pelasgi, was in truth very scanty. They did not look upon them as a mythical people of huge giants—us, for example, in the popular tales of the modern Greeks the ancestors of the latter are represented as mighty warriors, towering to the height of popular trees. There exist no Pelasgian myths, no Pelasgian gods, to be contrasted with the Greeks . . . Thucydides, in whom the historic consciousness of the Hellenes finds its clearest expression, also regards the inhabitants of Hellas from the most ancient times, Pelasgi as well as Hellenes, as one nation. . . . And furthermore, according to his opinion genuine sons of these ancient Pelasgi continued through all times to dwell in different regions, and especially in Attica."—E. Curtius, *Hist. of Greece*, bk. 1, ch. 1.—"It is inevitable that modern historians should take widely divergent views of a nation concerning which tradition is so uncertain. Some writers, among whom is Kiepert, think that the Pelasgi were a Semitic tribe, who immigrated into Greece. This theory, though it explains their presence on the coast, fails to account for their position at Dodona and in Thessaly. In another view, which has received the assent of Thirlwall and Duncker, Pelasgian is nothing more than the name of the ancient inhabitants of the country, which subsequently gave way to the title Achaean, as this in its turn was supplanted by the term Hellenes . . . We have no evidence to support the idea of a Pelasgic Age as a period of simple habits and agricultural occupations, which slowly gave way before the more martial age of the Achaeans. The civilization of the 'Achaean Age' exists only in the epic poems, and the 'Pelasgic Age' is but another name for the prehistoric Greeks, of whose agriculture we know nothing"—E. Abbott, *Hist. of Greece*, pt. 1, ch. 2.

ALSO IN. M. Duncker, *Hist. of Greece*, bk. 1, ch. 2.—See, also, DORIANS AND IONIANS, (ENO-TRIANS, ARYANS; and ITALY ANCIENT

PELAYO, King of the Asturias (or Oviedo) and Leon, A. D. 718-737

PELHAMS, The. See ENGLAND A. D. 1742-1745; and 1757-1760.

PELIGNIANS, The. See SABINES

PELISPIA, The proposed State of. See NORTHWEST TERRITORY. A. D. 1784

PELLA.—A new Macedonian capital founded by Archelaus, the ninth of the kings of Macedonia.

Surrendered to the Ostrogoths. See GOTHS (OSTROGOths): A. D. 473-488.

PELOPIDS.—PELOPONNESUS.—"Among the ancient legendary genealogies, there was none which figured with greater splendour, or which attracted to itself a higher degree of poetical interest and pathos, than that of the Pelopids:—Tantalus, Pelops, Atreus and Thyestes, Agamemnon and Menelaus and Aegisthus, Helen and Clytaenestra, Orestes and Elektra and Hermione. Each of these characters is a star of the first magnitude in the Grecian hemisphere. . . . Pelops is the eponym or name-giver of the Peloponnesus: to find an eponym for every conspicuous local name was the invariable turn of Grecian retrospective fancy. The

name Peloponnesus is not to be found either in the Iliad or the Odyssey, nor any other denomi nation which can be attached distinctly and specially to the entire peninsula. But we meet with the name in one of the most ancient post-Homeric poems of which any fragments have been preserved—the Cyprian Verses. . . . The attributes by which the Pelopid Agamemnon and his house are marked out and distinguished from the other heroes of the Iliad, are precisely those which Grecian imagination would naturally seek in an eponymus—superior wealth, power, splendour and regality."—G. Grote, *Hist. of Greece*, pt. 1, ch. 7.—"Of the . . . family of mythus

that of Pelops [is] especially remarkable as attaching itself more manifestly and decisively than any other Heroic myth to Ionia and Lydia. We remember the royal house of Tantalus enthroned on the banks of the Sipylus, and intimately associated with the worship of the Phrygian Mother of the Gods. Members of this royal house emigrate and cross to Hellas from the Ionian ports, they bring with them bands of adventurous companions, a treasure of rich culture and knowledge of the world, arms and ornaments, and splendid implements of furniture, and gain a following among the natives, hitherto combined in no political union. . . . Thus was the notion formed by men like Thucydides as to the epoch occasioned by the appearance of the Pelopidae in the earliest ages of the nation, and what element in this notion is either improbable or untenable. Do not all the traditions connected with Achaean princes of the house of Pelops point with one consent over the sea to Lydia?"—E. Curtius, *Hist. of Greece*, bk. 1, ch. 3

PELOPONNESIAN WAR, The. See GREECE B. C. 435-432, to B. C. 405; and ATHENS B. C. 431, and after.

PELOPONNESUS, The Doric migration to. See DORIANS AND IONIANS.

PELTIER TRIAL, The. See FRANCE: A. D. 1802-1803

PELUCONES, The.—The name of one of the parties in Chilean politics, supposed to have some resemblance to the English Whigs.—E. J. Payne, *Hist. of European Colonies*, p. 279.

PELUSIUM.—"Behind, as we enter Egypt [from the east] is the treacherous Lake Serbonis; in front the great marsh broadening towards the west, on the right the level melancholy shore of the almost tideless Mediterranean. At the very point of the angle stood of old the great stronghold Pelusium, Sin, in Ezekiel's days, 'the strength of Egypt' (xx. 15). The most eastward Nile stream flowed behind the city, and on the north was a port commodious enough to hold an ancient fleet . . . As the Egyptian monarchy waned, Pelusium grew in importance, for it was the strongest city of the border. Here the last king of the Saite line, Psammetichus III, son of Amasis, awaited Cambyses. The battle of Pelusium, which crushed the native power, may almost take rank among the decisive battles of the world. Had the Persians failed, they might never have won the command of the Mediterranean, without which they could scarcely have invaded Greece. Of the details of the action we know nothing."—R. S. Poole, *Cities of Egypt*, ch. 11.—It was at Pelusium that Pompey, defeated and flying from Cæsar, was assassinated.

PELUSIUM.

B. C. 47.—*Taken by the king of Pergamus.*
See ALEXANDRIA: B. C. 48-47.

A. D. 616.—*Surprised by Chosroes.* See EGYPT: A. D. 616-628.

A. D. 640.—*Capture by the Moslems.* See MAHOMETAN CONQUEST: A. D. 640-646.

PEMAQUID PATENT. See MAINE: A. D. 1629-1631.

A. D. 1664.—*Purchased for the Duke of York.* See NEW YORK: A. D. 1664.

PEN SELWOOD, Battle of.—The first battle fought, A. D. 1016, between the English king Edmund, or Eadmund, Ironsides, and his Danish rival Cnut, or Canute, for the crown of England. The Dane was beaten.

PENACOOK INDIANS. See AMERICAN ABORIGINES: ALGONQUIAN FAMILY.

PENAL LAWS AGAINST THE IRISH CATHOLICS. See IRELAND: A. D. 1691-1782.

PENANG. See STRAITS SETTLEMENTS.

PENDLE, Forest of.—A former forest in Lancashire, England.

PENDETON BILL, The. See CIVIL-SERVICE REFORM IN THE UNITED STATES.

PENDRAGON. See DRAGON.

PENNSYLVANIA, 1681.

PENESTÆ, The.—In ancient Thessaly there was "a class of serfs, or dependent cultivators, corresponding to the Laconian Helots, who, tilling the lands of the wealthy oligarchs, paid over a proportion of its produce, furnished the retainers by which these great families were surrounded, served as their followers in the cavalry, and were in a condition of villanage,—yet with the important reserve that they could not be sold out of the country, that they had a permanent tenure in the soil, and that they maintained among one another the relations of family and village. This . . . order of men, in Thessaly called the Penestæ, is assimilated by all ancient authors to the Helots of Laconia."—G. Grote, *Hist. of Greece*, pt. 2, ch. 3.

PENINSULAR CAMPAIGN OF McCELLAN. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1862 (MARCH—MAY: VIRGINIA); MAY: VIRGINIA), (JUNE: VIRGINIA), (JUNE—JULY: VIRGINIA), (JULY—AUGUST: VIRGINIA).

PENINSULAR WAR, The Spanish. See SPAIN: A. D. 1807-1808 to 1812-1814.

PENN, William, and the colony of Pennsylvania. See PENNSYLVANIA: A. D. 1681, and after.

PENNAMITE AND YANKEE WAR. See PENNSYLVANIA: A. D. 1753-1790.

PENNSYLVANIA.

The aboriginal inhabitants and their relations to the white colonists. See AMERICAN ABORIGINES: DELAWARES, SUSQUEHANNAS, and SHAWANESE.

A. D. 1629-1664.—*The Dutch and Swedes on the Delaware.* See DELAWARE: A. D. 1629-1631, and after.

A. D. 1632.—*Partly embraced in the Maryland grant to Lord Baltimore.* See MARYLAND: A. D. 1632.

A. D. 1634.—*Partly embraced in the Palatine grant of New Albion.* See NEW ALBION.

A. D. 1642.—*The settlement from New Haven, on the site of Philadelphia.* See NEW JERSEY: A. D. 1640-1655.

A. D. 1673.—*Repossession of the Delaware by the Dutch.* See NEW YORK: A. D. 1673.

A. D. 1681.—*The Proprietary grant to William Penn.*—"William Penn was descended from a long line of sailor ancestors. His father, an admiral in the British navy, had held various important naval commands, and in recognition of his services had been honored by knighthood. A member of Parliament, and possessed of a considerable fortune, the path of worldly advancement seemed open and easy for the feet of his son, who had received a liberal education at Oxford, continued in the schools of the Continent. Beautiful in person, engaging in manner, accomplished in manly exercises and the use of the sword, fortune and preferment seemed to wait the acceptance of William Penn. But at the very outset of his career the Divine voice fell upon his ears as upon those of St. Paul." He became a follower of George Fox, and one of the people known as Quakers or Friends. "Many trials awaited the youthful convert. His father cast him off. He underwent a considerable imprisonment in the Tower for 'urging the cause of freedom with importunity.' . . . In time these afflictions abated. The influence of his family

saved him from the heavier penalties which fell upon many of his co-religionists. His father on his death-bed reinstated him as his heir. 'Son William,' said the dying man, 'if you and your friends keep to your plain way of preaching and living, you will make an end of the priests.' Some years later we find him exerting an influence at Court which almost amounted to popularity. It is evident that, with all his boldness of opinion and speech, Penn possessed a tact and address which gave him the advantage over most of his sect in dealings with worldly people. . . . In 1680 his influence at Court and with moneyed men enabled him to purchase a large tract of land in east New Jersey, on which to settle a colony of Quakers, a previous colony having been sent out three years before to west New Jersey. Meanwhile a larger project filled his mind. His father had bequeathed to him a claim on the Crown for £16,000. Colonial property was then held in light esteem, and, with the help of some powerful friends, Penn was enabled so to press his claim as to secure the charter for that valuable grant which afterward became the State of Pennsylvania, and which included three degrees of latitude by five of longitude, west from the Delaware. 'This day,' writes Penn, Jan. 5, 1681, 'my country was confirmed to me by the name of Pennsylvania, a name the king [Charles II.] would give it in honour of my father. I chose New Wales, being as this a pretty hilly country. I proposed (when the Secretary, a Welshman, refused to have it called New Wales) Sylvania, and they added Penn to it, and though I much opposed it, and went to the King to have it struck out and altered, he said 'twas past, and he would take it upon him. . . . I feared lest it should be looked upon as a vanity in me, and not as a respect of the King, as it truly was, to my father, whom he often mentions with praise.' 'In return for this

grant of 26,000,000 of acres of the best land in the universe, William Penn, it was agreed, was to deliver annually at Windsor Castle two beaver-skins, pay into the King's treasury one fifth of the gold and silver which the province might yield, and govern the province in conformity with the laws of England and as became a liege of England's King. He was to appoint judges and magistrates, could pardon all crimes except murder and treason, and whatsoever things he could lawfully do himself, he could appoint a deputy to do, he and his heirs forever. The original grant was fantastically limited by a circle drawn twelve miles distant from New castle, northward and westward, to the beginning of the 40th degree of latitude. This was done to accommodate the Duke of York, who wished to retain the three lower counties as an appanage to the State of New York. A few months later he was persuaded to renounce this claim, and the charter of Penn was extended to include the western and southern shores of the Delaware Bay and River from the 43d degree of latitude to the Atlantic. . . . The charter confirmed, a brief account of the country was published, and lands offered for sale on the easy terms of 40 shillings a hundred acres, and one shilling a rent a year in perpetuity. Numerous adventurers, many of them men of wealth and respectability, offered. The articles of agreement included a provision as to 'just and friendly conduct to ward the natives'. In April, 1681, he sent forward 'young Mr Markham, his relative, with a small party of colonists to take possession of the grant, and prepare for his own coming during the following year. . . . In August, 1682, Penn himself embarked"—Susan Coolidge (S. C. Woolsey), *Short Hist. of Philadelphia*, ch. 2—"The charter [to Penn], which is given complete in Hazard's Annals, consists of 23 articles, with a preamble. The grant comprises all that part of America, islands included, which is bounded on the east by the Delaware River from a point on a circle twelve miles northward of New Castle town to the 43° north latitude if the Delaware extends so far, if not, as far as it does extend, and thence to the 43° by a meridian line. From this point westward five degrees of longitude on the 43° parallel, the western boundary to the 40th parallel, and thence by a straight line to the place of beginning. . . . Grants Penn rights to and use of rivers, harbors, fisheries, etc. . . . Creates and constitutes him Lord Proprietor of the Province, saving only his allegiance to the King, Penn to hold directly of the kings of England, 'as of our castle of Windsor in the county of Berks, in free and common socage, by fealty only, for all services, and not in capite, or by Knight's service, yielding and paying therefore to us, our heirs and successors, two beaver-skins'. . . . Grants Penn and his successors, his deputies and lieutenants, 'free, full, and absolute power' to make laws for raising money for the public uses of the Province, and for other public purposes at their discretion, by and with the advice and consent of the people or their representatives in assembly. . . . Grants power to appoint officers, judges, magistrates, etc., to pardon offenders."—J. T. Scharf and T. Westcott, *Hist. of Philadelphia*, ch. 7 (v. 1).

ALSO IN: T. Clarkson, *Memoirs of Wm. Penn*, v. 1, ch. 18-17.—S. Hazard, *Annals of Penn.*, pp. 485-504.

A. D. 1681-1682.—Penn's Frame of Government.—Before the departure from England of the first company of colonists, Penn drew up a Frame of Government which he submitted to them, and to which they gave their assent and approval by their signatures, his signing the instrument likewise. The next year this Frame of Government was published by Penn, with a preface, "containing his own thoughts upon the origin, nature, object, and modes of Government . . . The Frame, which followed this preface, consisted of twenty four articles; and the Laws, which were annexed to the latter, were forty. By the Frame the government was placed in the Governor and Freemen of the province, out of whom were to be formed two bodies, namely, a Provincial Council and a General Assembly. These were to be chosen by the Freemen, and though the Governor or his Deputy was to be perpetual President, he was to have but a treble vote. The Provincial Council was to consist of seventy two members. One third part, that is, twenty-four of them, were to serve for three years, one third for two, and the other third for one, so that there might be an annual succession of twenty four new members, each third part thus continuing for three years and no longer. It was the office of this Council to prepare and propose bills, to see that the laws were executed, to take care of the peace and safety of the province, to settle the situation of ports, cities, market towns, roads, and other public places, to inspect the public treasury, to erect courts of justice, institute schools, and reward the authors of useful discovery. Not less than two thirds of these were necessary to make a quorum, and the consent of not less than two thirds of such quorum in all matters of moment. The General Assembly was to consist of the first year of all the freemen, and the next of two hundred. These were to be increased afterwards according to the increase of the population of the province. They were to have no deliberative power, but, when bills were brought to them from the Governor and Provincial Council, to pass or reject them by a plain Yes or No. They were to present sheriffs and justices of the peace to the Governor, a double number for his choice of half. They were to be elected annually. All elections of members, whether to the Provincial Council or General Assembly, were to be by ballot. And this Charter or Frame of Government was not to be altered, changed, or diminished in any part or clause of it, without the consent of the Governor, or his heirs or assigns, and six parts out of seven of the Freemen both in the Provincial Council and General Assembly. With respect to the Laws, which I said before were forty in number, I shall only at present observe of them that they related to whatever may be included under the term 'Good Government of the Province'; some of them to liberty of conscience; others to civil officers and their qualifications, others to offences; others to legal proceedings, such as pleadings, processes, fines, imprisonments, and arrests; others to the natural servants and poor of the province. With respect to all of them it may be observed, that, like the Frame itself, they could not be altered but by the consent of the Governor, or his heirs, and the consent of six parts out of seven of the two bodies before mentioned."—T. Clarkson, *Memoirs of William Penn*, v. 1, ch. 18.

ALSO IN: S. Hazard, *Annals of Penn.*, pp. 558-574.

A. D. 1682.—**Acquisition by Penn of the claims of the Duke of York to Delaware.**—“During the negotiations between New Netherland and Maryland in 1659, the Dutch insisted that, as Lord Baltimore's patent covered only savage or uninhabited territory, it could not affect their own possession of the Delaware region. Accordingly, they held it against Maryland until it was taken from them by the Duke of York in 1664. But James's title by conquest had never been confirmed to him by a grant from the king; and Cecilius Calvert, the second Lord Baltimore, insisted that Delaware belonged to Maryland. To quiet controversy, the duke had offered to buy off Baltimore's claim, to which he would not agree. Penn afterward refused a large offer by Fenwick ‘to get of the duke his interest in Newcastle and those parts’ for West Jersey. Thus stood the matter when the Pennsylvania charter was sealed. Its proprietor soon found that his province, wholly inland, wanted a front on the sea. As Delaware was ‘necessary’ to Pennsylvania, Penn ‘endeavored to get it’ from the duke by maintaining that Baltimore's pretension ‘was against law, civil and common.’ Charles Calvert, the third Lord Baltimore, was ‘very free’ in talking against the Duke of York's rights, but he could not circumvent Penn. The astute Quaker readily got from James a quit-claim of all his interest in the territory included within the proper bounds of Pennsylvania. After a struggle, Penn also gained the more important conveyances [August, 1682] to himself of the duke's interest in all the region within a circle of twelve miles [radius] around Newcastle, and extending southward as far as Cape Henlopen. The triumphant Penn set sail the next week. At Newcastle he received from James's agents formal possession of the surrounding territory, and of the region farther south.”—J. R. Brodhead, *Hist. of N. Y.*, v. 2, ch. 7.

A. D. 1682-1685.—**Penn's arrival in his province.**—**His treaty with the Indians.**—**The founding of Philadelphia.**—Penn sailed, in person, for his province on the 1st of September, 1682, on the ship “Welcome,” with 100 fellow passengers, mostly Friends, and landed at Newcastle after a dreary voyage during which thirty of his companions had died of smallpox. “Next day he called the people together in the Dutch court-house, when he went through the legal forms of taking possession. . . . Penn's great powers being legally established, he addressed the people in profoundest silence. He spoke of the reasons for his coming—the great idea which he had nursed from his youth upwards—his desire to found a free and virtuous state, in which the people should rule themselves. . . . He spoke of the constitution he had published for Pennsylvania as containing his theory of government, and promised the settlers on the lower reaches of the Delaware, that the same principles should be adopted in their territory. Every man in his province, he said, should enjoy liberty of conscience and his share of political power. . . . The people listened to this speech with wonder and delight. . . . They had but one request to make in answer; that he would stay amongst them and reign over them in person. They besought him to annex their

territory to Pennsylvania, in order that the white settlers might have one country, one parliament, and one ruler. He promised, at their desire, to take the question of a union of the two provinces into consideration, and submit it to an assembly then about to meet at Upland. So he took his leave. Ascending the Delaware . . . the adventurers soon arrived at the Swedish town of Upland, then the place of chief importance in the province. . . . Penn changed the name from Upland to Chester, and as Chester it is known. Markham and the three commissioners had done their work so well that in a short time after Penn's arrival, the first General Assembly, elected by universal suffrage, was ready to meet. . . . As soon as Penn had given them assurances similar to those which he had made in Newcastle, they proceeded to discuss, amend, and accept the Frame of Government and the Provisional Laws. The settlers on the Delaware sent representatives to this ~~Assembly~~, and one of their first acts was to declare the two provinces united. The constitution was adopted without important alteration; and to the forty laws were added twenty-one others, and the infant code was passed in form. . . . Penn paid some visits to the neighbouring seats of government in New York, Maryland, and the Jerseys. At West River, Lord Baltimore came forth to meet him with a retinue of the chief persons in the province. . . . It was impossible to adjust the boundary, and the two proprietors separated with the resolution to maintain their several rights. . . . The lands already bought from the Redmen were now put up for sale at four-pence an acre, with a reserve of one shilling for every hundred acres as quit-rent, the latter sum intended to form a state revenue for the Governor's support. Amidst these sales and settlements he recollects George Fox, for whose use and profit he set aside a thousand acres of the best land in the province. . . . Penn was no less careful for the Redskins. Laying on one side all ceremonial manners, he won their hearts by his easy confidence and familiar speech. He walked with them alone into the forests. He sat with them on the ground to watch the young men dance. He joined in their feasts, and ate their roasted hominy and acorns. . . . Having now become intimate with Taminent and other of the native kings, who had approved these treaties, seeing great advantages in them for their people, he proposed to hold a conference with the chiefs and warriors, to confirm the former treaties and form a lasting league of peace. On the banks of the Delaware, in the suburbs of the rising city of Philadelphia, lay a natural amphitheatre, used from time immemorial as a place of meeting for the native tribes. The name of Sakimaxing—now corrupted by the white men into Shackamaxon—means the place of kings. At this spot stood an aged elm-tree, one of those glorious elms which mark the forests of the New World. It was a hundred and fifty-five years old; under its spreading branches friendly nations had been wont to meet; and here the Redskins smoked the calumet of peace long before the pale-faces landed on those shores. Markham had appointed this locality for his first conference, and the land commissioners wisely followed his example. Old traditions had made the place sacred to one of the contracting parties,—and when Penn

proposed his solemn conference, he named Saki-maxing [or Shackamaxon] as a place of meeting with the Indian kings. Artists have painted, poets sung, philosophers praised this meeting of the white men and the red [October 14, 1682].

... All being seated, the old king announced to the Governor that the natives were prepared to hear and consider his words. Penn then rose to address them. ... He and his children, he went on to say, never fired the rifle, never trusted to the sword, they met the red men on the broad path of good faith and good will. They meant no harm, and had no fear. He read the treaty of friendship, and explained its clauses. It recited that from that day the children of Onas and the nations of the Lenni Len apé should be brothers to each other,—that all paths should be free and open—that the doors of the white men should be open to the red men, and the lodges of the red men should be open to the white men,—that the children of Onas should not believe any false reports of the Lenni Lenapé, nor the Lenni Lenapé of the children of Onas, but should come and see for themselves, ... that if any son of Onas were to do any harm to any Redskin, or any Redskin were to do harm to a son of Onas, the sufferer should not offer to right himself, but should complain to the chiefs and to Onas, that justice might be declared by twelve honest men, and the wrong buried in a pit with no bottom,—that the Lenni Lenapé should assist the white men, and the white men should assist the Lenni Lenapé, against all such as would disturb them or do them hurt, and, lastly, that both Christians and Indians should tell their children of this league and chain of friendship, that it might grow stronger and stronger, and be kept bright and clean, without rust or spot, while the waters ran down the creeks and rivers, and while the sun and moon and stars endured. He had the scroll on the ground. The sachems received his proposal for themselves and for their children. No oaths, no seals, no mummeries, were used, the treaty was ratified on both sides with yea—and, unlike treaties which are sworn and sealed, was kept. When Penn had sailed, he held a note in his mind of six things to be done on landing. (1) to organize his government; (2) to visit Friends in Delaware, Pennsylvania and New Jersey, (3) to conciliate the Indians, (4) to see the Governor of New York, who had previously governed his province; (5) to fix the site for his capital city, (6) to arrange his differences with Lord Baltimore. The subject of his chief city occupied his anxious thought, and Markham had collected information for his use. Some people wished to see Chester made his capital; but the surveyor, Thomas Holme, agreed with Penn that the best locality in almost every respect was the neck of land lying at the junction of the Delaware and the Skuylkill rivers. ... The point was known as Wicocoa. ... The land was owned by three Swedes, from whom Penn purchased it on their own terms; and then, with the assistance of Holme, he drew his plan. ... Not content to begin humbly, and allow house to be added to house, and street to street, as people wanted them, he formed the whole scheme of his city—its name, its form, its streets, its docks, and open spaces—fair and perfect in his mind, before a single stone was laid. According to his original design, Philadelphia was to

cover with its houses, squares, and gardens, twelve square miles. ... One year from the date of Penn's landing in the New World, a hundred houses had been built; two years later there were six hundred houses."—W. H. Dixon, *Hist. of William Penn*, ch. 24-25

ALSO IN: J. T. Scharf and T. Westcott, *Hist. of Philadelphia*, v. 1, ch. 9.—*Memoirs of the Penn Hist. Soc.*, v. 8 (*The Belt of Wampum, &c.*)—W. C. Bryant and S. H. Gay, *Popular Hist. of the U. S.*, v. 2, ch. 20

A. D. 1685.—The Maryland Boundary question.—Points in dispute with Lord Baltimore.—“The grant to Penn confused the old controversy between Virginia and Lord Baltimore as to their boundary, and led to fresh controversies. The question soon arose. What do the descriptions, ‘the beginning of the fortieth,’ and ‘the beginning of the three and fortieth degree of northern latitude,’ mean? If they meant the 40th and 43d parallels of north latitude, as most historians have held, Penn's province was the zone, three degrees of latitude in width, that leaves Philadelphia a little to the south and Syracuse a little to the north; but if those descriptions meant the belts lying between 39° and 40° , and 42° and 43° , as some authors have held, then Penn's southern and northern boundaries were 39° and 42° north. A glance at the map of Pennsylvania will show the reader how different the territorial dispositions would have been if either one of these constructions had been carried out. The first construction would avoid disputes on the south, unless with Virginia west of the mountains, on the north it would not conflict with New York, but would most seriously conflict with Connecticut and Massachusetts west of the Delaware. The second construction involved disputes with the two southern colonies concerning the degree $39-40$ to the farthest limit of Pennsylvania, and it also overlapped Connecticut's claim to the degree $41-42$. Perhaps we cannot certainly say what was the intention of the king, or Penn's first understanding; but the Quaker proprietary and his successors adopted substantially the second construction, and thus involved their province in the most bitter disputes. The first quarrel was with Lord Baltimore. It has been well said that this ‘notable quarrel’ ‘continued more than eighty years; was the cause of endless trouble between individuals; occupied the attention not only of the proprietors of the respective provinces, but of the Lords of Trade and Plantations, of the High Court of Chancery, and of the Privy Councils of at least three monarchs, it greatly retarded the settlement and development of a beautiful and fertile country, and brought about numerous tumults, which sometimes ended in bloodshed.’”—B. A. Hinsdale, *The Old Northwest*, ch. 7.—“As the Duke of York claimed, by right of conquest, the settlements on the western shores of the Bay of Delaware, and had, by his deed of 1682, transferred to William Penn his title to that country, embracing the town of Newcastle and twelve miles around it (as a reasonable portion of land attached to it), and as far down as what was then called Cape Henlopen, an important subject of controversy was the true situation of that cape, and the ascertainment of the southern and western boundaries of the country along the bay, as transferred by the Duke's deed. ... After two personal interviews in America, the Proprietaries

separated without coming to any arrangement and with mutual recriminations and dissatisfaction. And they each wrote to the Lords of Plantations excusing themselves and blaming the other. . . . At length, in 1685, one important step was taken toward the decision of the conflicting claims of Maryland and Pennsylvania, by a decree of King James' Council, which ordered, 'that for avoiding further differences, the tract of land lying between the Bay of Delaware and the eastern sea, on the one side, and the Chesapeake Bay on the other, be divided into equal parts, by a line from the latitude of Cape Henlopen to the 40th degree of north latitude, the southern boundary of Pennsylvania by Charter, and that the one half thereof, lying towards the Bay of Delaware and the eastern sea, be adjudged to belong to his majesty, and the other half to Lord Baltimore, as comprised in his charter.' . . . This decree of King James, which evidently exhibits a partiality towards the claims of Penn in decreeing the eastern half of the peninsula to his majesty, with whom Lord Baltimore could not presume, and indeed had declined to dispute, instead of to the Proprietary himself, by no means removed the difficulties which hung over this tedious, expensive, and vexatious litigation. For . . . there existed as much uncertainty with respect to the true situation of Cape Henlopen and the ascertainment of the middle of the Peninsula, as any points in contest."—J. Dunlop, *Memoir on the Controversy between William Penn and Lord Baltimore* (*Penn Hist. Soc. Memoirs*, v. 1)—See, below, 1760-1767

A. D. 1691-1702.—Practical separation of Delaware. See DELAWARE A.D. 1691-1702

A. D. 1692-1696.—Keith's schism.—Penn deprived of his government, but restored.—Early resistance to the proprietary yoke.—"While New England and New York were suffering from war, superstition, and the bitterness of faction, Pennsylvania was not without internal troubles. These troubles originated with George Keith, a Scotch Quaker, formerly surveyor general of East Jersey, and at this time master of the Quaker school at Philadelphia, and champion of the Quakers against Cotton Mather and the Boston ministers. Pressing the doctrines of non-resistance to their logical conclusion, Keith advanced the opinion that Quaker principles were not consistent with the exercise of political authority. He also attacked negro slavery as inconsistent with those principles. There is no surer way of giving mortal offense to a sect or party than to call upon it to be consistent with its own professed doctrines. Keith was disowned by the yearly meeting, but he forthwith instituted a meeting of his own, to which he gave the name of Christian Quakers. In reply to a 'Testimony of Denial' put forth against him, he published an 'Address,' in which he handled his adversaries with very little ceremony. He was fined by the Quaker magistrates for insolence, and Bradford, the only printer in the colony, was called to account for having published Keith's address. Though he obtained a discharge, Bradford, however, judged it expedient to remove with his types to New York, which now [1692] first obtained a printing press. The Episcopalians and other non-Quakers professed great sympathy for Keith, and raised a loud outcry against Quaker intolerance. Keith himself presently embraced Episcopacy, went to

England, and took orders there. The Quaker magistrates were accused of hostility to the Church of England, and in the alleged maladministration of his agents, joined with his own suspected loyalty, a pretense was found for depriving Penn of the government—a step taken by the Privy Council without any of the forms, or, indeed, any authority of law, though justified by the opinions of some of the leading Whig lawyers of that day." Governor Fletcher of New York was now authorized for a time to administer the government of Pennsylvania and Delaware. He accordingly visited Philadelphia, and called an Assembly in which deputies from both provinces were present. Penn's frame of government was disregarded, the Assembly being modeled after that of New York. Fletcher hoped to obtain a salary for himself and some contributions toward the defense of the northern frontier. The Quakers, very reluctant to vote money at all, had special scruples about the lawfulness of war. They were also very suspicious of designs against their liberties, and refused to enter on any business until the existing laws and liberties of the province had been first expressly confirmed. This concession reluctantly made, Fletcher obtained the grant of a small sum of money, not, however, without stipulating that it 'should not be dipped in blood'. The suspicions against Penn soon dying away, the administration of his province was restored to him [1694]. But the pressure of his private affairs—for he was very much in debt—detained him in England, and he sent a commission to Markham [his relative and representative in Pennsylvania] to act as his deputy. An Assembly called by Markham refused to recognize the binding force of Penn's frame of government which, indeed, had been totally disregarded by Fletcher. To the restrictions on their authority imposed by that frame they would not submit. A second Assembly [1696] proved equally obstinate, and, as the only means of obtaining a vote of the money required of the province toward the defense of New York, Markham was obliged to agree to a new act of settlement, securing to the Assembly the right of originating laws. A power of disapproval was reserved, however, to the proprietary, and this act never received Penn's sanction."—R. Hildreth, *Hist. of the U. S.*, ch. 21 (v. 2)

ALSO IN: G. E. Ellis, *Life of Penn*, ch. 10 (*Library of Am. Biog.*, series 2, v. 12).—G. P. Fisher, *The Colonial Era*, ch. 16.

A. D. 1696-1749.—Suppression of colonial manufactures. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A.D. 1698-1749.

A. D. 1701-1718.—The new Charter of Privileges and the city charter of Philadelphia.—The divorcing of Delaware.—Differences with the Proprietary.—The death of Penn.—It was not until 1699 that Penn returned to his domain after an absence of fifteen years, and his brief stay of two years was not made wholly agreeable to him. Between him and his colonists there were many points of friction, as was inevitable under the relationship in which they stood to one another. The assembly of the province would not be persuaded to contribute to the fortification of the northern frontier of the king's dominions (in New York) against the French and Indians. Penn's influence, however, prevailed upon that body to adopt measures for suppres-

sing both piracy and illicit trade. With much difficulty, moreover, he settled with his subjects the terms of a new constitution of government, or Charter of Privileges, as it was called. The old Frame of Government was formally abandoned and the government of Pennsylvania was now organized upon an entirely new footing. "The new charter for the province and territories, signed by Penn, October 25, 1701 was more republican in character than those of the neighboring colonies. It not only provided for an assembly of the people with great powers including those of creating courts but to a certain extent it submitted to the choice of the people the nomination of some of the county officers. The section concerning liberty of conscience did not discriminate against the members of the Church of Rome. The closing section fulfilled the promise already made by Penn, that in case the representatives of the two territorial districts [Pennsylvania proper held under Penn's original grant, and the Lower Counties, afterwards constituting Delaware, which he acquired from the Duke of York] could not agree within three years to join in legislative business, the Lower Counties should be separated from Pennsylvania. On the same day Penn established by letters patent a council of state for the province to consult and assist the proprietary himself or his deputy with the best of their advice and council in public affairs and matters relating to the government and the peace and well-being of the people, and in the absence of the proprietary or upon the deputy's absence out of the province his death or other incapacity to exercise all and singular the powers of government. The original town and borough of Philadelphia having by this time become near equal to the city of New York in trade and riches was raised, by patent of the 25th of October 1701 to the rank of a city and like the province could boast of having a more liberal charter than her neighbors for the municipal officers were to be elected by the representatives of the people of the city and not appointed by the governor as in New York. The government of the province had been entrusted by Penn to Andrew Hamilton, also governor for the proprietors in New Jersey, with James Logan as provincial secretary, to whom was likewise confided the management of the proprietary estates, thus making him in reality the representative of Penn and the leader of his party. Hamilton died in December, 1702, but before his death he had endeavored in vain to bring the representatives of the two sections of his government together again. The Delaware members remained obstinate, and finally, while Edward Shippen, a member of the council and first mayor of Philadelphia, was acting as president, it was settled that they should have separate assemblies, entirely independent of each other. The first separate assembly for Pennsylvania proper met at Philadelphia, in October, 1703, and by its first resolution showed that the Quakers so dominant in the province, were beginning to acquire a taste for authority, and meant to color their religion with the hue of political power." In December, 1703, John Evans, a young Welshman, appointed deputy-governor by Penn, arrived at Philadelphia, and was soon involved in quarrels with the assemblies. "At one time they had for ground the refusal of the Quakers to support

the war which was waging against the French and Indians on the frontiers. At another they disagreed upon the establishment of a judiciary. These disturbances produced financial disruptions, and Penn himself suffered therefrom to such an extent that he was thrown into a London prison, and had finally to mortgage his province for £6 600. The recall of Evans in 1709, and the appointment of Charles Gookin in his stead, did not mend matters. Logan, Penn's intimate friend and representative, was finally compelled to leave the country, and, going to England (1710), he induced Penn to write a letter to the Pennsylvania assembly, in which he threatened to sell the province to the crown, a surrender by which he was to receive £12 000. The transfer was in fact prevented by an attack of apoplexy from which Penn suffered in 1712. The epistle, however, brought the refractory assembly to terms. In 1717 Gookin involved himself in fresh troubles and was recalled. Sir William Keith was then appointed—"the last governor commissioned by Penn himself, for the great founder of Pennsylvania died in 1718. After Penn's death his heirs went to law among themselves about the government and proprietary rights in Pennsylvania.—B. Fernow, *Middle Colonies (Narrative and Critical Hist. of Am., 1-5 ch. 3)*

ALSO IN G. E. Elly's *Life of Penn (Library of Am. Biog. series 2 v. 12) ch. 11-12*—R. Proud, *Hist. of Pennsylvania, ch. 14-22 (v. 1-2)*—Penn and Logan Correspondence (Penn Hist. Soc. *Memorials* v. 9-10)

A. D. 1709-1710—Immigration of Palatines and other Germans. See *PALETTINES*

A. D. 1740-1741—First settlements and missions of the Moravian Brethren. See *MORAVIAN BRETHREN*

A. D. 1743—Origin of the University of Pennsylvania. See *EDUCATION, MODERN AMERICA* A. D. 1683-1779

A. D. 1744-1748—King George's War. See *NEW ENGLAND* A. D. 1744, 1745, and 1745-1748

A. D. 1748-1754.—First movements beyond the mountains to dispute possession with the French. See *OHIO (VALLEY)* A. D. 1748-1754

A. D. 1753-1799—Connecticut claims and settlements in the Wyoming Valley.—The Pennamite and Yankee War.—"The charter bounds [of Connecticut] extended west to the Pacific Ocean [see *CONNECTICUT* A. D. 1662-1664] this would have carried Connecticut over a strip covering the northern two fifths of the present State of Pennsylvania. Stuart faithlessness interfered with this doubly. Almost immediately after the grant of the charter, Charles granted to his brother James the Dutch colony of New Netherland thus interrupting the continuity of Connecticut. Rather than resist the king's brother, Connecticut agreed and ratified the interruption. In 1681 a more serious interference took place. Charles granted to Penn the province of Pennsylvania, extending westward five degrees between the 40th and 43d parallels of north latitude." Under the final compromise of Penn's boundary dispute with Lord Baltimore the northern line of Pennsylvania was moved southward to latitude 42° instead of 43°, but it still absorbed five degrees in length of the Connecticut western belt. "The territory taken from Connecticut by the Penn grant would be

bounded southerly on the present map by a straight line entering Pennsylvania about Stroudsburg, just north of the Delaware Water Gap, and running west through Hazelton, Catawissa, Clearfield, and New Castle, taking in all the northern coal, iron, and oil fields. It was a royal heritage, but the Penns made no attempt to settle it, and Connecticut until the middle of the 18th century had no energy to spare from the task of winning her home territory 'out of the fire, as it were, by hard blows and for small recompense.' This task had been fairly well done by 1750, and in 1753 a movement to colonize in the Wyoming country was set on foot in Windham county. It spread by degrees until the Susquehanna Company was formed the next year, with nearly 700 members, of whom 638 were of Connecticut. Their agents made a treaty with the Five Nations July 11, 1754, by which they bought for £2,000 a tract of land beginning at the 41st degree of latitude, the southerly boundary of Connecticut; thence running north, following the line of the Susquehanna at a distance of ten miles from it, to the present northern boundary of Pennsylvania; thence 120 miles west; thence south to the 41st degree and back to the point of beginning. In May, 1755, the Connecticut general assembly expressed its acquiescence in the scheme, if the king should approve it; and it approved also a plan of Samuel Hazard, of Philadelphia, for another colony, to be placed west of Pennsylvania, and within the chartered limits of Connecticut. The court might have taken stronger ground than this; for, at the meeting of commissioners from the various colonies at Albany, in 1754, the representatives of Pennsylvania being present, no opposition was made to a resolution that Connecticut and Massachusetts, by charter right, extended west to the South Sea. The formation of the Susquehanna Company brought out objections from Pennsylvania, but the company sent out surveyors and plotted its tract. Settlement was begun on the Delaware River in 1757, and in the Susquehanna purchase in 1762. This was a temporary settlement, the settlers going home for the winter. A permanent venture was made the next year on the flats below Wilkes Barre, but it was destroyed by the Indians the same year. In 1768 the company marked out five townships, and sent out forty settlers for the first, Kingston. Most of them, including the famous Captain Zebulon Butler, had served in the French and Indian War; and their first step was to build the 'Forty Fort.' The Penns, after their usual policy, had refused to sell lands, but had leased plots to a number of men on condition of their 'defending the lands from the Connecticut claimants.' The forty Connecticut men found these in possession when they arrived in February, 1769, and a war of wreaths and arrests followed for the remainder of the year. The Pennsylvania men had one too powerful argument, in the shape of a four-pounder gun, and they retained possession at the end of the year. Early in 1770 the forty reappeared, captured the four-pounder, and secured possession. For a time in 1771 the Pennsylvania men returned, put up a fort of their own, and engaged in a partisan warfare; but the numbers of the Connecticut men were rapidly increasing, and they remained masters until the opening of the Revolution, when they numbered some 8,000.

... But for the Revolution, the check occasioned by the massacre [of 1778—see UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1778 (JULY)], and the appearance of a popular government in place of the Penns, nothing could have prevented the establishment of Connecticut's authority over all the regions embraced in her western claims. ... The articles of confederation went into force early in 1781. One of their provisions empowered congress to appoint courts of arbitration to decide disputes between States as to boundaries. Pennsylvania at once availed herself of this, and applied for a court to decide the Wyoming dispute. Connecticut asked for time, in order to get papers from England; but congress overruled the motion, and ordered the court to meet at Trenton in November, 1782. After forty-one days of argument, the court came to the unanimous conclusion that Wyoming, or the Susquehanna district, belonged to Pennsylvania and not to Connecticut." Connecticut yielded to the decision at once; but, in 1786, when, following New York and Virginia, she was called upon to make a cession of her western territorial claims to congress (see UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1781-1786) she compensated herself for the loss of the Susquehanna district by reserving from the cession "a tract of about the same length and width as the Wyoming grant, west of Pennsylvania, in northeastern Ohio . . . ; and this was the tract known as the Western Reserve of Connecticut. It contained about 3,500,000 acres. . . . The unfortunate Wyoming settlers, deserted by their own State, and left to the mercy of rival claimants, had a hard time of it for years. The militia of the neighboring counties of Pennsylvania was mustered to enforce the writs of Pennsylvania courts; the property of the Connecticut men was destroyed, their fences were cast down, and their rights ignored; and the 'Pennamite and Yankee War' began. . . . The old Susquehanna Company was reorganized in 1785-86, and made ready to support its settlers by force. New Yankee faces came crowding into the disputed territory. Among them was Ethan Allen, and with him came some Green Mountain Boys." It was not until 1799 that the controversy came to an end, by the passage of an act which confirmed the title of the actual settlers.—A. Johnston, *Connecticut*, ch. 15.

ALSO IN: C. Miner, *Hist. of Wyoming, letters 5-12*.—W. L. Stone, *Poetry and Hist. of Wyoming*, ch. 4-5.

A. D. 1754.—Building of Fort Duquesne by the French.—The first armed collision in the western valley. See OHIO (VALLEY): A. D. 1754.

A. D. 1754.—The Colonial Congress at Albany, and Franklin's Plan of Union. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1754.

A. D. 1755.—The opening of the French and Indian War.—Braddock's defeat.—The frontier ravaged. See OHIO (VALLEY): A. D. 1755.

A. D. 1755-1760.—French and Indian War.—Conquest of Canada and the west. See CANADA: A. D. 1755, 1766, 1758-1757, 1758, 1759, 1760; and NOVA SCOTIA: A. D. 1755.

A. D. 1757-1762.—The question of taxation in dispute with the proprietaries.—Franklin's mission to England.—"For a long while past the relationship between the Penns, unworthy sons of the great William, and now the proprie-

ties, on the one side, and their quasi subjects, the people of the Province, upon the other, had been steadily becoming more and more strained, until something very like a crisis had [in 1757] been reached. As usual in English and Anglo-American communities, it was a quarrel over dollars, or rather over pounds sterling, a question of taxation, which was producing the alienation. At bottom, there was the trouble which always pertains to absenteeism, the proprietaries lived in England, and regarded their vast American estate, with about 200,000 white inhabitants, only as a source of revenue. . . . The chief point in dispute was, whether or not the waste lands, still directly owned by the proprietaries, and other lands let by them at quitrents, should be taxed in the same manner as like property of other owners. They refused to submit to such taxation, the Assembly of Burgesses insisted. In ordinary times the proprietaries prevailed, for the governor was their nominee and removable at their pleasure; they gave him general instructions to assent to no law taxing their holdings, and he naturally obeyed his masters. But since governors got their salaries only by virtue of a vote of the Assembly, it seems that they sometimes disregarded instructions, in the sacred cause of their own interests. After a while, therefore, the proprietaries, made shrewd by experience, devised the scheme of placing their unfortunate sub-rulers under bonds. This went far towards settling the matter. Yet in such a crisis and stress as were now present in the colony . . .

it certainly seemed that the rich and idle proprietaries might stand on the same footing with their poor and laboring subjects. They lived comfortably in England upon revenues estimated to amount to the then enormous sum of £20,000 sterling, while the colonists were struggling under unusual losses, as well as enormous expenses, growing out of the war and Indian ravages. At such a time their parsimony, their 'incredible meanness,' as Franklin called it, was cruel as well as stupid. At last the Assembly flatly refused to raise any money unless the proprietaries should be burdened like the rest. All should pay together, or all should go to destruction together. The Penns too stood obstinate, facing the not less resolute Assembly. It was indeed a deadlock! Yet the times were such that neither party could afford to maintain its ground indefinitely. So a temporary arrangement was made, whereby of £60,000 sterling to be raised the proprietaries agreed to contribute £5,000, and the Assembly agreed to accept the same in lieu or commutation for their tax. But neither side abandoned its principle. Before long more money was needed, and the dispute was as fierce as ever. The burgesses now thought that it would be well to carry a statement of their case before the king in council and the lords of trade. In February, 1757, they named their speaker, Isaac Norris, and Franklin to be their emissaries 'to represent in England the unhappy situation of the Province,' and to seek redress by an act of Parliament. Norris, an aged man, begged to be excused; Franklin accepted. . . . A portion of his business also was to endeavor to induce the king to resume the Province of Pennsylvania as his own. A clause in the charter had reserved this right, which could be exercised on payment of a certain sum of money. The colonists now preferred

to be an appanage of the crown rather than a fief of the Penns." In this latter object of his mission Franklin did not succeed; but he accomplished its main purpose, procuring, after long delays, from the board of trade, a decision which subjected the proprietary estate to its fair share of taxation. He returned home after an absence of five years.—J. T. Morse, Jr., *Benjamin Franklin*, ch. 3.

ALSO IN: J. Parton, *Life of Franklin*, pt. 3 (v. 1)

A. D. 1760-1767.—Settlement of the Maryland boundary dispute.—Mason and Dixon's line.—The decision of 1685 (see above), in the boundary dispute between the proprietaries of Pennsylvania and Maryland, "formed the basis of a settlement between the respective heirs of the two proprietaries in 1732. Three years afterward, the subject became a question in chancery; in 1750 the present boundaries were decreed by Lord Hardwicke, ten years later, they were, by agreement, more accurately defined; and, in 1761, commissioners began to designate the limit of Maryland on the side of Pennsylvania and Delaware. In 1763, Charles Mason and Jeremiah Dixon, two mathematicians and surveyors [sent over from England by the proprietaries], were engaged to mark the lines. In 1764, they entered upon their task, with good instruments and a corps of axemen, by the middle of June, 1765, they had traced the parallel of latitude to the Susquehanna; a year later, they climbed the Little Alleghany, in 1767, they carried forward their work, under an escort from the Six Nations, to an Indian war-path, 244 miles from the Delaware River. Others continued Mason and Dixon's line to the bound of Pennsylvania on the south west"—G. Bancroft, *Hist. of the U. S. (Author's last rev.)*, pt. 2, ch. 16—"The east and west line which they [Mason and Dixon] ran and marked . . . is the Mason and Dixon's line of history, so long the boundary between the free and the slave States. Its precise latitude is 39° 43' 26 3" north. The Penns did not, therefore, gain the degree 39-40, but they did gain a zone one fourth of a degree in width, south of the 40th degree, to their western limit, because the decision of 1760 controlled that of 1779, made with Virginia. Pennsylvania is narrower by nearly three-fourths of a degree than the charter of 1681 contemplated. No doubt, however, the Penns considered the narrow strip gained at the south more valuable than the broad one lost at the north"—B. A. Hinsdale, *The Old Northwest*, ch. 7.

ALSO IN: T. Donaldson, *The Public Domain*, p. 50—*Pennsylvania Archives*, v. 4, pp. 1-37.—W. H. Browne, *Maryland*, pp. 238-239.

A. D. 1763-1764.—Pontiac's War.—Bouquet's expedition. See *PONTIAC'S WAR*.

A. D. 1763-1766.—The question of taxation by Parliament.—The Sugar Act.—The Stamp Act and its repeal.—The Declaratory Act.—The Stamp Act Congress. See *UNITED STATES OF AM.*: A. D. 1760-1775; 1763-1764; 1765; and 1766.

A. D. 1765.—Patriotic self-denials.—Non-importation agreements. See *UNITED STATES OF AM.*: A. D. 1764-1767.

A. D. 1766-1768.—The Townshend duties.—The Circular Letter of Massachusetts. See *UNITED STATES OF AM.*: A. D. 1768-1767; and 1767-1768.

A. D. 1768.—The boundary treaty with the Six Nations at Fort Stanwix. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1765-1768.

A. D. 1768-1774.—Opening events of the Revolution. See BOSTON: A. D. 1768, to 1773; and UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1770, to 1774.

A. D. 1774.—The western territorial claims of Virginia pursued.—Lord Dunmore's War with the Indians. See OHIO (VALLEY): A. D. 1774.

A. D. 1775.—The Beginning of the War of the American Revolution.—Lexington.—Concord.—Action taken upon the news.—Ticonderoga.—Bunker Hill.—The Second Continental Congress. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1775.

A. D. 1776.—The end of royal and proprietary government.—Adoption of a State Constitution.—"Congress, on the 15th of May, 1776, recommended . . . 'the respective Assemblies and conventions of the United Colonies, where no government sufficient to the exigencies of their affairs has been hitherto established, to adopt such government as shall, in the opinion of the representatives of the people, best conduce to the happiness and safety of their constituents in particular, and America in general.' A diversity of opinion existed in the Province upon this resolution. . . . The Assembly referred the resolve of Congress to a committee, but took no further action, nor did the committee ever make a report. 'The old Assembly,' says Westcott, 'which had adjourned on the 14th of June, to meet on the 14th of August, could not obtain a quorum, and adjourned again to the 23d of September. It then interposed a feeble remonstrance against the invasion of its prerogatives by the Convention, but it was a dying protest. The Declaration of Independence had given the old State Government a mortal blow, and it soon expired without a sigh—thus ending forever the Proprietary and royal authority in Pennsylvania.' In the meantime, the Committee of Correspondence for Philadelphia issued a circular to all the county committees for a conference in that city on Tuesday, the 18th day of June. . . . The Conference at once unanimously resolved, 'That the present government of this Province is not competent to the exigencies of our affairs, and that it is necessary that a Provincial Convention be called by this Conference for the express purpose of forming a new government in this Province on the authority of the people only.' Acting upon these resolves, preparations were immediately taken to secure a proper representation in the Convention. . . . Every voter was obliged to take an oath of renunciation of the authority of George III., and one of allegiance to the State of Pennsylvania, and a religious test was prescribed for all members of the Convention. . . . The delegates to the Convention to frame a constitution for the new government consisted of the representative men of the State—men selected for their ability, patriotism, and personal popularity. They met at Philadelphia, on the 15th of July, . . . and organized by the selection of Benjamin Franklin, president, George Ross, vice-president, and John Morris and Jacob Garrigues, secretaries. . . . On the 28th of September, the Convention completed its labors by adopting the first State Constitution, which went into immediate effect, without a vote of the people. . . .

The legislative power of the frame of government was vested in a General Assembly of one House, elected annually. The supreme executive power was vested in a President, chosen annually by the Assembly and Council, by joint ballot—the Council consisting of twelve persons, elected in classes, for a term of three years. A Council of Censors, consisting of two persons from each city and county, was to be elected in 1783, and in every seventh year thereafter, whose duty it was to make inquiry as to whether the Constitution had been preserved inviolate during the last septennary, and whether the executive or legislative branches of the government had performed their duties."—W. H. Egle, *Hist. of Penn.*, ch. 9.—See, also, UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1776-1779.

A. D. 1776-1777.—The Declaration of Independence.—The struggle for the Hudson and the Delaware.—Battles of the Brandywine and Germantown.—The British in Philadelphia. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1776 and 1777; and PHILADELPHIA: A. D. 1777-1778.

A. D. 1777-1779.—The Articles of Confederation.—The alliance with France.—British evacuation of Philadelphia.—The war on the northern border. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1777-1781, to 1779.

A. D. 1778 (July).—The Wyoming Massacre. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1778 (JULY).

A. D. 1779-1786.—Final settlement of boundaries with Virginia. See VIRGINIA: A. D. 1779-1786.

A. D. 1780.—Emancipation of Slaves. See SLAVERY, NEGRO: A. D. 1688-1780.

A. D. 1780-1783.—The last campaigns of the war.—Peace. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1780, to 1783.

A. D. 1781.—Mutiny of the Pennsylvania Line. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1781 (JANUARY).

A. D. 1785.—First Protective Tariff. See TARIFF LEGISLATION: A. D. 1785.

A. D. 1787.—Federal Constitution. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1787; 1787-1789.

A. D. 1794.—The Whiskey Insurrection.—"In every part of the United States except Pennsylvania, and in by far the larger number of the counties of that state, the officers of the Federal Government had been able to carry the excise law [passed in March, 1791, on the recommendation of Hamilton], unpopular as it generally was, into execution; but resistance having been made in a few of the western counties, and their defiance of law increasing with the forbearance of the Government in that State, prosecutions had been ordered against the offenders. In July, the Marshal of the District, Lenox, who was serving the process, and General Neville, the Inspector, were attacked by a body of armed men, and compelled to desist from the execution of their official duties. The next day, a much larger number, amounting to 500 men, assembled, and endeavored to seize the person of General Neville. Failing in that, they exacted a promise from the Marshal that he would serve no more process on the west side of the Alleghany; and attacking the Inspector's house, they set fire to it, and destroyed it with its contents. On this occasion, the leader of the assailants was killed, and several of them wounded. Both the Inspector and Marshal were required to

resign; but they refused, and sought safety in flight. A meeting was held a few days later, at Mingo Creek meeting-house, which recommended to all the townships in the four western counties of Pennsylvania, and the neighboring counties of Virginia, to meet, by their delegates, at Parkinson's ferry, on the Monongahela, on the 14th of August, 'to take into consideration the situation of the western country.' Three days after this meeting, a party of the malcontents seized the mail, carried it to Canonsburg, seven miles distant, and there opened the letters from Pittsburgh to Philadelphia, to discover who were hostile to them. They then addressed a circular letter to the officers of the militia in the disaffected counties, informing them of the intercepted letters, and calling on them to rendezvous at Braddock's Field on the 1st of August, with arms in good order, and four days' provision. . . . This circular was signed by seven persons, but the prime mover was David Bradford, a lawyer, who was the prosecuting attorney of Washington County. In consequence of this summons, a large body of men, which has been estimated at from five to seven thousand, assembled at Braddock's Field on the day appointed. . . . Bradford took upon himself the military command, which was readily yielded to him. . . . Bradford proposed the expulsion from Pittsburgh of several persons whose hostility had been discovered by the letters they had intercepted, but his motion was carried only as to two persons, Gibson and Neville, son of the Inspector. They then decided to proceed to Pittsburgh. Some assented to this, to prevent the mischief which others meditated. But for this, and the liberal refreshments furnished by the people of Pittsburgh, it was thought that the town would have been burnt. . . . The President issued a proclamation reciting the acts of treason, commanding the insurgents to disperse, and warning others against abetting them. He, at the same time, wishing to try lenient measures, appointed three Commissioners to repair to the scene of the insurrection, to confer with the insurgents, and to offer them pardon on condition of a satisfactory assurance of their future obedience to the laws. . . . Governor Mifflin followed the example of the President in appointing Commissioners to confer with the insurgents, with power to grant pardons, and he issued an admonitory proclamation, after which he convened the Legislature to meet on the 3d of November. The Federal and the State Commissioners reached the insurgent district while the convention at Parkinson's ferry was in session. It assembled on the 14th of August, and consisted of 226 delegates, all from the western counties of Pennsylvania, except six from Ohio County in Virginia. They appointed Cook their Chairman, and Albert Gallatin, Secretary, though he at first declined the appointment. . . . The Commissioners required . . . an explicit assurance of submission to the laws; a recommendation to their associates of a like submission; and meetings of the citizens to be held to confirm these assurances. All public prosecutions were to be suspended until the following July, when, if there had been no violation of the law in the interval, there should be a general amnesty. These terms were deemed reasonable by the sub-committee; but before the meeting of sixty took place, a body of armed men entered Brownsville,

the place appointed for the meeting, and so alarmed the friends of accommodation, that they seemed to be driven from their purpose. Gallatin, however, was an exception, and the next day, he addressed the committee of sixty in favor of acceding to the proposals of the Commissioners; but nothing more could be effected than to pass a resolution that it would be to the interest of the people to accept those terms, without any promise or pledge of submission. . . . On the whole, it was the opinion of the well-disposed part of the population, that the inspection laws could not be executed in that part of the State; and that the interposition of the militia was indispensable. The Commissioners returned to Philadelphia, and on their report the President issued a second proclamation, on the 25th of September, in which he announced the march of the militia, and again commanded obedience to the laws. The order requiring the militia to march was promptly obeyed in all the States except Pennsylvania, in which some pleaded defects in the militia law; but even in that State, after the Legislature met, the Governor was authorised to accept the services of volunteers. . . . The news that the militia were on the march increased the numbers of the moderate party. . . . Bradford, who was foremost in urging resistance to the law, was the first to seek safety in flight. He sought refuge in New Orleans. A second convention was called to meet at Parkinson's ferry on the second of October. A resolution of submission was passed, and a committee of two was appointed to convey it to the President at Carlisle. . . . On the return of the committee, the Parkinson ferry convention met for the third time, and resolutions were passed, declaring the sufficiency of the civil authorities to execute the laws; affirming that the excise duties would be paid, and recommending all delinquents to surrender themselves. . . . Lee, then, as Commander-in-chief, issued a proclamation granting an amnesty to all who had submitted to the laws; and calling upon the inhabitants to take the oath of allegiance to the United States. Orders were issued and executed to seize those offenders who had not signed the declaration of submission, and send them to Philadelphia; and thus was this purpose of resisting the execution of the excise law completely defeated, and entire order restored in less than four months from the time of the burning of Neville's house, which was the first overt act of resistance. It was, however, deemed prudent to retain a force of 2,500 militia during the winter, under General Morgan, to prevent a return of that spirit of disaffection which had so long prevailed in Pennsylvania."—Geo. Tucker, *Hist. of the U. S.*, v. 1, ch. 7.

ALSO IN: J. T. Morse, *Life of Hamilton*, v. 2, ch. 4.—T. Ward, *The Insurrection of 1794* (*Memoirs of Penn. Hist. Soc.*, v. 6).—J. B. McMaster, *Hist. of the People of the U. S.*, ch. 9 (v. 2).

A. D. 1861.—First troops sent to Washington. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1861 (APRIL).

A. D. 1863.—Lee's invasion.—Battle of Gettysburg. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1863 (JUNE—JULY). PENNSYLVANIA.

A. D. 1864.—Early's invasion.—Burning of Chambersburg. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1864 (JULY: VIRGINIA—MARYLAND).

PENNSYLVANIA BANK, The. See MONEY AND BANKING: A. D. 1780-1784.

PENNSYLVANIA GERMANS.—“When the news spread through the Old World that William Penn, the Quaker, had opened an asylum to the good and the oppressed of every nation, and Humanity went through Europe gathering up the children of misfortune, our forefathers came out from their hiding places in the forest depths and the mountain valleys which the sun never penetrated, clad in homespun, their feet shod with wood, their dialects oftentimes unintelligible to each other. There was scarcely a family among them which could not be traced to some ancestor burned at the stake for conscience sake. Judge Pennypacker says: ‘Beside a record like theirs the sufferings of Pilgrim and Quaker seem trivial.’ . . . The thousands of Germans, Swiss and Dutch who migrated here on the invitation of Penn, came without ability to speak the English language, and without any knowledge, except that derived from general report, of the customs and habits of thought of the English people. They went vigorously to work to clear the wilderness and establish homes. They were sober, religious, orderly, industrious and thrifty. The reports the earlier settlers made to their friends at home of the prosperity and liberty they enjoyed in their new homes, induced from year to year many others to come. Their numbers increased so much as to alarm the proprietary officials. Logan wanted their immigration prevented by Act of Parliament, ‘for fear the colony would in time be lost to the crown.’ He wrote a letter in which he says: ‘The numbers from Germany at this rate will soon produce a German colony here, and perhaps such a one as Britain received from Saxony in the 5th Century.’ As early as 1747, one of the proprietary Governors attributed the prosperity of the Pennsylvania colony to the thrift, sobriety and good characters of the Germans. Numerous as they were, because this was in its government a purely English colony, the part they took in its public affairs was necessarily limited. The Government officials and the vast majority of the members of the Assembly were all English. During the long struggle in the Colonies to adjust the strained relations with Great Britain, the Germans were seemingly indifferent. They saw no practical gain in surrendering the Penn Charter, and Proprietary Government, under which they had obtained their homes, for the direct rule of the British King. They could not understand the distinction between King and Parliament. . . . When, therefore, in 1776, the issue was suddenly enlarged into a broad demand for final separation from Great Britain, and the creation of a Republic, all their traditional love of freedom was fully aroused. Under the Proprietary rule, although constituting nearly one-half the population of the colony, they were practically without representation in the General Assembly, and without voice in the Government. The right of ‘electing or being elected’ to the Assembly was confined to natural born subjects of England, or persons naturalized in England or in the province, who were 21 years old, and freeholders of the province owning fifty acres of seated land, and at least twelve acres improved, or worth clear fifty pounds and a resident for two years. Naturalization was not the simple thing it now is. The conditions were exceptionally severe, and con-

paratively few Germans qualified themselves to vote. The delegates to the Colonial Congress were selected by the General Assembly. In November, 1775, the Assembly instructed the Pennsylvania delegates not to vote for separation from Great Britain. The majority of the delegates were against separation. . . . At the election for new members in May, 1776, in Philadelphia, three out of four of those elected were opposed to separation. The situation was most critical. Independence and union were not possible without Pennsylvania. Geographically, she was midway between the Colonies. She was one of the wealthiest and strongest. Her government was in the hands of those opposed to separation. One course only remained. Peaceful efforts in the Assembly to enfranchise the Germans, by repealing the naturalization laws and oath of allegiance, had failed, and now this must be accomplished by revolution, because their enfranchisement would give the friends of liberty and union an overwhelming and aggressive majority. This was the course resolved on. The Philadelphia Committee called a conference of committees of the Counties. On the 18th of June, 1776, this provincial conference, numbering 104, met in Philadelphia. The German counties were represented no longer by English Tories. There were leading Germans in the delegations from Philadelphia, Lancaster, Northampton, York, Bucks and Berks. In Berks, the loyalist Biddle gives place to eight prominent Germans, headed by Gov. Heister, Cols. Hunter, Eckert and Lutz. The proprietary government of Pennsylvania, with its Tory Assembly, was overthrown—foundation, pillar and dome. This conference called a Provincial Convention to frame a new Government. On the petition of the Germans, the members of that Convention were to be elected by persons qualified to vote for Assembly, and by the military associators (volunteers), being freemen 21 years of age, resident in the province one year. This gave the Germans the right to vote. Thus says Bancroft: ‘The Germans were incorporated into the people and made one with them.’ The 19th of June, 1776, enfranchised the Germans, and made the Declaration of Independence possible. . . . It is absolutely true, that, as the English people of the province were divided in 1776, the Germans were the potential factors in securing the essential vote of Pennsylvania for the Declaration of Independence. . . . Throughout the Revolution, these Germans . . . were the steadfast defenders of the new Republic. Dr. Stillé, in his recent admirable ‘Life of Dickinson,’ concedes that ‘no portion of the population was more ready to defend its homes, or took up arms more willingly, in support of the American cause.’ Washington, when in Philadelphia after the war, testified his high appreciation of the hearty support the Germans gave him, and the cause he represented, by worshiping with his family in the old German church on Race street. The descendants of the Pennsylvania-Germans have settled all over the West, contributing to Ohio, Illinois and other Western States, the same sturdy, honest population that characterizes Pennsylvania.”—E. K. Martin and G. F. Baer, *Addresses (Proceedings, Pennsylvania-German Convention, Apr. 15, 1891)*.

PENNY NEWSPAPERS. The beginning of. See PRINTING AND PRESS: A. D. 1850-1860 and 1858-1870.

PENNY POSTAGE.

PENNY POSTAGE. See POST.

PENOBSCTS, The.—A division of the great Indian tribe of the Abnakis was so called
PENSACOLA: Unauthorized capture by General Jackson (1818). See FLORIDA. A.D. 1816-1818.

PENTAPOLIS IN AFRICA. See CYRENE.

PENTATHLON, The.—The five exercises of running, leaping, wrestling, throwing the diskos, and throwing the spear, formed what the Greeks called the pentathlon. "At the four great national festivals all these had to be gone through on one and the same day, and the prize was awarded to him only who had been victorious in all of them"—E. Guhl and W. Koner, *Life of the Greeks and Romans*, sect. 52

PEORIAS, The. See AMERICAN ABORIGINES. ALGONQUIAN FAMILY.

PEPIN. See PIPPIN.

PEPLUM, The.—"The peplum constituted the outermost covering of the body. Among the Greeks it was worn in common by both sexes, but was chiefly reserved for occasions of ceremony or of public appearance, and, as well in its texture as in its shape, seemed to answer to our shawl. When very long and ample, so as to admit of being wound twice round the body—first under the arms, and the second time over the shoulders—it assumed the name of diplax. In rainy or cold weather it was drawn over the head. At other times this peculiar mode of wearing it was expressive of humility or of grief."—T. Hope, *Costume of the Ancients*, i. 1

PEPPERELL, Sir William, and the expedition against Louisburg. See NEW ENGLAND. A.D. 1745

PEQUOTS.—PEQUOT WAR. See AMERICAN ABORIGINES. ALGONQUIAN FAMILY, and SHAWANESE, also, NEW ENGLAND. A.D. 1637

PERA, The Genoese established at. See GENOA. A.D. 1261-1299

PERCEVAL MINISTRY, The. See ENGLAND. A.D. 1806-1812

PERDICCAS, and the wars of the Diadochi. See MACEDONIA. B.C. 333-316

PERDUELLIO, The Crime of.—"Perduellio, derived from 'duellum' e q. 'bellum,' properly speaking signifies 'a public enemy,' and hence Perduellio was employed [among the Romans] in legal phraseology to denote the crime of hostility to one's native country, and is usually represented as corresponding, in a general sense, to our term High Treason."—W. Ramsay, *Manual of Roman Antiqu.*, ch. 9.—See MAJESTAS.

PERED, Battle of (1849). See AUSTRIA. A.D. 1848-1849.

PEREGRINI.—"The term 'Peregrinus,' with which in early times 'Hostis' (i.e. stranger) was synonymous, embraced, in its widest acceptation, every one possessed of personal freedom who was not a *Civis Romanus*. Generally, however, Peregrinus was not applied to all foreigners indiscriminately, but to those persons only, who, although not *Cives*, were connected with Rome."—W. Ramsay, *Manual of Roman Antiqu.*, ch. 8.—See, also, CIVES ROMANI

PERGAMUM, OR PERGAMUS.—This ancient city in northwestern Asia Minor, within the province of Mysia, on the north of the river Caicus, became, during the troubled century that followed the death of Alexander, first the seat of an important principality, and then the

PERONNE.

capital of a rich and flourishing kingdom, to which it gave its name. It seems to have owed its fortunes to a great deposit of treasures—part of the plunder of Asia—which Lysimachus, one of the generals and successors of Alexander, left for safe keeping within its walls, under the care of an eunuch, named Philetaerus. This Philetaerus found excuses, after a time, for renouncing allegiance to Lysimachus, appropriating the treasures and using them to make himself lord of Pergamum. He was succeeded by a nephew, Eumenes, and he in turn by his cousin Attalus. The latter, "who had succeeded to the possession of Pergamum in 241 [B.C.], met and vanquished the Galatians in a great battle, which gave him such popularity that he was able to assume the title of king, and extend his influence far beyond his inherited dominion . . . The court of Pergamum continued to flourish till it controlled the larger part of Asia Minor. In his long reign this king represented almost as much as the King of Egypt the art and culture of Hellenism. His great victory over the Galatians was celebrated by the dedication of so many splendid offerings to various shrines, that the Pergamene school made a distinct impression upon the world's taste. Critics have enumerated seventeen remaining types, which appear to have come from statues of that time—the best known is the so called 'Dying Gladiator,' who is really a dying Galatian."—Perhaps the literature of the court was even more remarkable. Starting on the model of Alexandria, with a great library, Attalus was far more fortunate than the Ptolemies in making his university the home of Stoic philosophy"—J. P. Mahaffy, *Story of Alexander's Empire*, ch. 20.—From the assumption of the crown by Attalus I the kingdom of Pergamum existed about a century. Its last king bequeathed it to the Romans in 133 B.C. and it became a Roman province. Its splendid library of 200,000 volumes was given to Cleopatra a century later by Antony, and was added to that of Alexandria. The name of the city is perpetuated in the word parchment, which is derived therefrom. Its ruins are found at a place called Bergama. See, also, SELUCIDÆ. B.C. 234-187. ALEXANDRIA. B.C. 282-246; and ROME. B.C. 47-46.

A.D. 1336.—Conquest by the Ottoman Turks. See TURKS (OTTOMAN). A.D. 1826-1859.

PERGAMUS, Citadel of. See TROJA.

PERICLES, Age of. See ATHENS. B.C. 466-454, and 445-429

PERIM. See ADEN.

PERINTHUS: B.C. 340.—Siege by Philip of Macedon. See GREECE. B.C. 340.

PERIOECI, The. See SPARTA. THE CITY.

PERIPLUS.—The term *periplus*, in the usage of Greek and Roman writers, signified a voyage round the coast of some sea.

PERIZZITES, The.—"The name 'Perizzites,' where mentioned in the Bible, is not meant to designate any particular race, but country people, in contradistinction to those dwelling in towns."—F. Lenormant, *Manual of Ancient Hist.*, bk. 6, ch. 1.

PERMANENT SETTLEMENT OF BENGAL LAND REVENUE. See INDIA. A.D. 1785-1798.

PERONNE, The Treaty of. See BURGUNDY. A.D. 1467-1468.

PERPETUAL EDICT, The. See NETHERLANDS: A. D. 1575-1577.

PERPIGNAN: A. D. 1642.—Siege and capture by the French. See SPAIN: A. D. 1640-1642.

PERRHÆBIANS, The.—“There had dwelt in the valley of the Peneus [Thessaly] from the earliest times a Pelasgic nation, which offered up thanks to the gods for the possession of so fruitful a territory at the festival of Peloria. . . . Larissa was the ancient capital of this nation. But at a very early time the primitive inhabitants were either expelled or reduced to subjection by more northern tribes. Those who had retired into the mountains became the Perrhæbians nation, and always retained a certain degree of independence. In the Homeric catalogue the Perrhæbians are mentioned as dwelling on the hill Cyphus, under Olympus.”—C. O. Müller, *Hist. and Antiq. of the Doric Race*, bk. 1, ch. 1.—Dr. Curtius is of the opinion that the Dorians were a subdivision of the Perrhæbians.—*Hist. of Greece*, bk. 1, ch. 4.

PERRY, Commodore Matthew C.: Expedition to Japan. See JAPAN: A. D. 1852-1888.

PERRY, Commodore Oliver H.: Victory on Lake Erie. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1812-1813.

PERRYVILLE, Battle of. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1862 (JUNE—OCTOBER: TENNESSEE—KENTUCKY).

PERSARGADÆ. See PERSIA, ANCIENT PEOPLE, &c.

PERSARMENIA.—While the Persians possessed Armenia Major, east of the Euphrates, and the Romans held Armenia Minor, west of that river, the former region was sometimes called Persarmenia.

PERSECUTIONS, Religious.—Of Albigenses. See ALBIGENSES. . . . Of Christians under the Roman Empire. See ROME: A. D. 64-68; 96-138; 192-284; 303-305; and CHRISTIANITY: A. D. 100-312. . . . Of Hussites in Bohemia. See BOHEMIA: A. D. 1419-1434, and after. . . . Of Jews. See JEWS. . . . Of Lollards. See ENGLAND: A. D. 1360-1414. . . . Of Protestants in England. See ENGLAND: A. D. 1555-1558. . . . Of Protestants in France. See FRANCE: A. D. 1532-1547; 1559-1561 to 1598-1599; 1661-1680; 1681-1698. . . . Of Protestants in the Netherlands. See NETHERLANDS: A. D. 1521-1555 to 1594-1609. . . . Of Roman Catholics in England. See ENGLAND: A. D. 1572-1608; 1585-1587; 1587-1588; 1678-1679. . . . Of Roman Catholics in Ireland. See IRELAND: A. D. 1691-1782. . . . Of Christians in Japan. See JAPAN: A. D. 1549-1686. . . . Of the Waldenses. See WALDENSES. . . . See, also, INQUISITION.

PERSEIDÆ, The. See ARGOS.—ARGOLIS.

PERSEPOLIS: Origin. See PERSIA, ANCIENT PEOPLE.

B. C. 330.—Destruction by Alexander.—Although Persepolis was surrendered to him on his approach to it (B. C. 331), Alexander the Great determined to destroy the city. “In this their home the Persian kings had accumulated their national edifices, their regal sepulchres, the inscriptions commemorative of their religious or legendary sentiment, with many trophies and acquisitions arising out of their conquests. For the purposes of the Great King's empire, Babylon, or Susa, or Ecbatana, were more central and convenient residences; but Persepolis was

still regarded as the heart of Persian nationality. It was the chief magazine, though not the only one, of those annual accumulations from the imperial revenue, which each king successively increased, and which none seems to have ever diminished. . . . After appropriating the regal treasure—to the alleged amount of 120,000 talents in gold and silver (=£27,600,000 sterling)—Alexander set fire to the citadel. . . . The persons and property of the inhabitants were abandoned to the licence of the soldiers, who obtained an immense booty, not merely in gold and silver, but also in rich clothing, furniture, and ostentatious ornaments of every kind. The male inhabitants were slain, the females dragged into servitude; except such as obtained safety by flight, or burned themselves with their property in their own houses.”—G. Grote, *Hist. of Greece*, pt. 2, ch. 93.

PERSIA: Ancient people and country.—“Persia Proper seems to have corresponded nearly to that province of the modern Iran which still bears the ancient name slightly modified, being called Farsistan or Fars. . . . Persia Proper lay upon the gulf to which it has given name, extending from the mouth of the Tab (Oroatis) to the point where the gulf joins the Indian Ocean. It was bounded on the west by Susiana, on the north by Media Magna, on the east by Mycia, and on the south by the sea. Its length seems to have been about 450, and its average width about 250 miles. . . . The earliest known capital of the region was Pasargadæ, or Persagadæ, as the name is sometimes written, of which the ruins still exist near Murgab, in lat. 30° 15', long. 53° 17'. Here is the famous tomb of Cyrus. . . . At the distance of thirty miles from Pasargadæ, or of more than forty by the ordinary road, grew up the second capital, Persepolis. . . . The Empire, which, commencing from Persia Proper, spread itself, toward the close of the sixth century before Christ, over the surrounding tracts, [extended from the Caspian Sea and the Indian Desert to the Mediterranean and the Propontis]. . . . The earliest appearance of the Persians in history is in the inscriptions of the Assyrian kings, which begin to notice them about the middle of the ninth century, B. C. At this time Shalmancer II. [the Assyrian king] found them in south-western Armenia, where they were in close contact with the Medes, of whom, however, they seem to have been wholly independent. . . . It is not until the reign of Sennacherib that we once more find them brought into contact with the power which aspired to be mistress of Asia. At the time of their re-appearance they are no longer in Armenia, but have descended the line of Zagros and reached the districts which lie north and north-east of Susiana. . . . It is probable that they did not settle into an organized monarchy much before the fall of Nineveh. . . . The history of the Persian ‘Empire’ dates from the conquest of Astyages [the Median king] by Cyrus, and therefore commences with the year B. C. 558 [or, according to Sayce, B. C. 549—see below].”—G. Rawlinson, *Five Great Monarchies: Persia*, ch. 1 and 7.

ALSO IN: A. H. Sayce, *Ancient Empires of the East*, app. 5.—See, also, ARIANS; IRAN; and ACHAMENIDES.

The ancient religion. See ZOROASTRIANISM.

B. C. 549-521.—The founding of the empire by Cyrus the Great, King of Elam.—His conquest of Media, Persia, Lydia, and Babylonian.—The restoration of the Jews.—Conquest of Egypt by Cambyses.—"It was in B. C. 549 that Astyages was overthrown [see MEDIA]. On his march against Kyros [Cyrus] his own soldiers, drawn probably from his Aryan subjects, revolted against him and gave him into the hands of his enemy. 'The land of Ecbatana and the royal city' were ravaged and plundered by the conqueror; the Aryan Medes at once acknowledged the supremacy of Kyros, and the empire of Kyaxares was destroyed. Some time, however, was still needed to complete the conquest; the older Mede population still held out in the more distant regions of the empire, and probably received encouragement and promises of help from Babylonia. In B. C. 546, however, Kyros marched from Arbela, crossed the Tigris, and destroyed the last relics of Median independence. . . . The following year saw the opening of the campaign against Babylonia [see BABYLONIA: B. C. 625-539]. But the Babylonian army, encamped near Sippara, formed a barrier which the Persians were unable to overcome: and trusting, therefore, to undermine the power of Nabonidus by secret intrigues with his subjects, Kyros proceeded against Kresos. A single campaign sufficed to capture Sardes and its monarch, and to add Asia Minor to the Persian dominions [see LYDIANS, and ASIA MINOR: B. C. 724-539]. The Persian conqueror was now free to attack Babylonia. Here his intrigues were already bearing fruit. The Jewish exiles were anxiously expecting him to redeem them from captivity, and the tribes on the sea coast were ready to welcome a new master. In B. C. 538 the blow was struck. The Persian army entered Babylonia from the south. The army of Nabonidus was defeated at Rata in June; on the 14th of that month Sippara opened its gates, and two days later Gobryas, the Persian general, marched into Babylon itself 'without battle and fighting'. . . . In October Kyros himself entered his new capital in triumph."—A. H. Sayce, *The Ancient Empires of the East: Herodotus 1-3. Appendix 5.*—"The history of the downfall of the great Babylonian Empire, and of the causes, humanly speaking, which brought about a restoration of the Jews, has recently been revealed to us by the progress of Assyrian discovery. We now possess the account given by Cyrus himself, of the overthrow of Nabonidus, the Babylonian king, and of the conqueror's permission to the captives in Babylonia to return to their homes. The account is contained in two documents, written, like most other Assyrian and Babylonian records, upon clay, and lately brought from Babylonia to England by Mr. Rassam. One of these documents is a tablet which chronicles the events of each year in the reign of Nabonidus, the last Babylonian monarch, and continues the history into the first year of Cyrus, as king of Babylon. The other is a cylinder, on which Cyrus glorifies himself and his son Cambyses, and professes his adherence to the worship of Bel-Merodach, the patron-god of Babylon. The tablet-inscription is, unfortunately, somewhat mutilated, especially at the beginning and the end, and little can be made out of the annals of the first five years of Nabonidus, except that he was occupied with disturbances in Syria. In

the sixth year the record becomes clear and continuous. . . . The inscriptions . . . present us with an account of the overthrow of the Babylonian Empire, which is in many important respects very different from that handed down to us by classical writers. We possess in them the contemporaneous account of one who was the chief actor in the events he records, and have ceased to be dependent upon Greek and Latin writers, who could not read a single cuneiform character, and were separated by a long lapse of time from the age of Nabonidus and Cyrus. Perhaps the first fact which will strike the mind of the reader with astonishment is that Cyrus does not call himself and his ancestors kings of Persia, but of Elam. The word used is Anzan or Ansan, which an old Babylonian geographical tablet explains as the native name of the country which the Assyrians and Hebrews called Elam. This statement is verified by early inscriptions found at Susa and other places in the neighbourhood, and belonging to the ancient monarchs of Elam, who contended on equal terms with Babylonia and Assyria until they were at last conquered by the Assyrian king Assur-bani-pal, and their country made an Assyrian province. In these inscriptions they take the imperial title of 'king of Anzan.' The annalistic tablet lets us see when Cyrus first became king of Persia. In the sixth year of Nabonidus (B. C. 549) Cyrus is still king of Elam; in the ninth year he has become king of Persia. Between these two years, therefore, he must have gained possession of Persia either by conquest or in some peaceable way. When he overthrew Astyages his rule did not as yet extend so far. At the same time Cyrus must have been of Persian descent, since he traces his ancestry back to Teispes, whom Darius, the son of Hystaspes, in his great inscription on the sacred rock of Behistun, claims as his own forefather. . . . The fact that Susa or Shushan was the original capital of Cyrus explains why it remained the leading city of the Persian Empire; and we can also now understand why it is that in Isaiah xxi. 2, the prophet bids Elam and Media, and not Persia and Media, 'go up' against Babylon. That Cyrus was an Elamite, however, is not the only startling revelation which the newly-discovered inscriptions have made to us. We learn from them that he was a polytheist who worshipped Bel-Merodach and Nebo, and paid public homage to the deities of Babylon. We have learned a similar fact in regard to his son Cambyses from the Egyptian monuments. These have shown us that the account of the murder of the sacred bull Apis by Cambyses given by Herodotus is a fiction; a tablet accompanying the huge granite sarcophagus of the very bull he was supposed to have wounded has been found with the image of Cambyses sculptured upon it kneeling before the Egyptian god. The belief that Cyrus was a monotheist grew out of the belief that he was a Persian, and like other Persians, a follower of the Zoroastrian faith; there is nothing in Scripture to warrant it. Cyrus was God's shepherd only because he was His chosen instrument in bringing about the restoration of Israel. . . . The first work of Cyrus was to ingratiate himself with the conquered population by affecting a show of zeal and piety towards their gods, and with the nations which had been kept in captivity in Babylonia, by sending them and their deities back to their homes.

Among these nations were the Jews, who had perhaps assisted the king of Elam in his attack upon Nabonidos. Experience had taught Cyrus the danger of allowing a disaffected people to live in the country of their conquerors. He therefore reversed the old policy of the Assyrian and Babylonian kings, which consisted in transporting the larger portion of a conquered population to another country, and sought instead to win their gratitude and affection by allowing them to return to their native lands. He saw, moreover, that the Jews, if restored from exile, would not only protect the southwestern corner of his empire from the Egyptians, but would form a base for his intended invasion of Egypt itself. . . . The number of exiles who took advantage of the edict of Cyrus, and accompanied Zerubbabel to Jerusalem, amounted to 42,360. It is probable, however, that this means only the heads of families; if so, the whole body of those who left Babylon, including women and children, would have been about 200,000. . . . The conquest of Babylonia by Cyrus took place in the year 538 B. C. He was already master of Persia, Media, and Lydia; and the overthrow of the empire of Nebuchadnezzar extended his dominions from the mountains of the Hindu Kush on the east to the shores of the Mediterranean on the west. Egypt alone of the older empires of the Oriental world remained independent, but its doom could not be long delayed. The career of Cyrus had indeed been marvellous. He had begun as the king only of Anzau or Elam, whose power seemed but 'small' and contemptible to his neighbour the great Babylonian monarch. But his victory over the Median king Astyages and the destruction of the Median Empire made him at once one of the most formidable princes in Western Asia. Henceforth the seat of his power was moved from Susa or Shushan to Ecbatana, called Achmetha in Scripture, Hagnatana in Persian, the capital of Media. . . . The conquest of Media was quickly followed by that of Persia, which appears to have been under the government of a collateral branch of the family of Cyrus. Henceforward the king of Elam becomes also the king of Persia. The empire of Lydia, which extended over the greater part of Asia Minor, fell before the army of Cyrus about B. C. 540. . . . The latter years of the life of Cyrus were spent in extending and consolidating his power among the wild tribes and unknown regions of the Far East. When he died, all was ready for the threatened invasion of Egypt. This was carried out by his son and successor Kambyses, who had been made 'king of Babylon' three years before his father's death, Cyrus reserving to himself the imperial title of 'King of the world.' . . . As soon as Kambyses became sole sovereign, Babylon necessarily took rank with Shushan and Ecbatana. It was the third centre of the great empire, and in later days the Persian monarchs were accustomed to make it their official residence during the winter season. . . . Kambyses was so fascinated by his new province that he refused to leave it. The greater part of his reign was spent in Egypt, where he so thoroughly established his power and influence that it was the only part of the empire which did not rise in revolt at his death. . . . Soon after his father's death he stained his hands with the blood of his brother Bardes, called Smerdis by Herodotus, to whom Cyrus had assigned the

eastern part of his empire. Bardes was put to death secretly at Susa, it is said. . . . A Magian, Gaumata or Gomates by name, who resembled Bardes in appearance, came forward to personate the murdered prince, and Persia, Media, and other provinces at once broke into rebellion against their long-absent king. When the news of this revolt reached Kambyses he appointed Aryandes satrap of Egypt, and, if we may believe the Greek accounts, set out to oppose the usurper. He had not proceeded far, however, before he fell by his own hand. The false Bardes was now master of the empire. Darius, in his inscription on the rock of Behistun, tells us that 'he put to death many people who had known Bardes, to prevent its being known that he was not Bardes, son of Cyrus.' At the same time he remitted the taxes paid by the provinces, and proclaimed freedom for three years from military service. But he had not reigned more than seven months before a conspiracy was formed against him. Darius, son of Hystaspes, attacked him at the head of the conspirators, in the land of Nisaea in Media, and there slew him, on the 10th day of April, B. C. 521. Darius, like Kambyses, belonged to the royal Persian race of Akhæmenes." —A. H. Sayce, *Introduction to the Books of Ezra, Nehemiah and Esther*, ch. 1 and 3.

ALSO IN: The same, *Fresh Light from the Ancient Monuments*, ch. 7.—Z. A. Ragozin, *The Story of Media, Babylon and Persia*, ch. 10-12.

B. C. 521-493.—The reign of Darius I.—His Indian and Scythian expeditions.—The Ionian revolt and its suppression.—Aid given to the insurgents by Athens.—"Darius I, the son of Hystaspes, is rightly regarded as the second founder of the Persian empire. His reign is dated from the first day of the year answering to B. C. 521; and it lasted 36 years, to Dec. 28, B. C. 486. . . . Throughout the Behistun Inscription Darius represents himself as the hereditary champion of the Achaemenids, against Gaumates and all other rebels. . . . It is 'by the grace of Ormazd' that he does everything. . . . This restoration of the Zoroastrian worship, and the putting down of several rebellions, are the matters recorded in the great trilingual inscription at Behistun, which Sir Henry Rawlinson dates, from internal evidence, in the sixth year of Darius (B. C. 516). . . . The empire of which Darius became king embraced, as he says, the following provinces: 'Persia, Susiana, Babylonia, Assyria, Arabia, Egypt; those which are of the sea (the islands), Saparda, Ionia, Media, Armenia, Cappadocia, Parthia, Zarangia, Aria, Chorasmia, Bactria, Sogdiana, Gandaria, the Sacae, Sattagydia, Arachotia, and Mecia: in all twenty-three provinces.' . . . All the central provinces constituting the original empire, from the mountains of Armenia to the head of the Persian Gulf, as well as several of those of the Iranian table-land, had to be reconquered. . . . Having thus restored the empire, Darius pursued new military expeditions and conquests in the true spirit of its founder. To the energy of youth was added the fear that quiet might breed new revolts; and by such motives, if we may believe Herodotus, he was urged by Queen Atossa —at the instigation of the Greek physician, Democedes— to the conquest of Greece; while he himself was minded to construct a bridge which should join Asia to Europe, and so to carry war into Scythia. It seems to have been

according to an Oriental idea of right, and not as a mere pretext, that he claimed to punish the Scythians for their invasion of Media in the time of Cyaxares. So he contented himself, for the present, with sending spies to Greece under the guidance of Democedes, and with the reduction of Samos. The Scythian expedition, however, appears to have been preceded by the extension of the empire eastward from the mountains of Afghanistan—the limit reached by Cyrus—over the valley of the Indus. . . . The part of India thus added to the empire, including the Punjab and apparently Scinde, yielded a tribute exceeding that of any other province. . . . The Scythian Expedition of Darius occupies the greater part of the Fourth Book of Herodotus. . . . The great result of the expedition, in which the king and his army narrowly escaped destruction, was the gaining of a permanent footing in Europe by the conquest of Thrace and the submission of Macedonia. . . . It was probably in B. C. 508 that Darius, having collected a fleet of 600 ships from the Greeks of Asia, and an army of 700,000 or 800,000 men from all the nations of his empire, crossed the Hellespont by a bridge of boats, and marched to the Danube, conquering on his way the Thracians within, and the Getæ beyond, the Great Balkan. The Danube was crossed by a bridge formed of the vessels of the Ionians, just above the apex of its Delta. The confusion in the geography of Herodotus makes it as difficult as it is unprofitable to trace the direction and extent of the march, which Herodotus carries beyond the Tanais (Don), and probably as far north as 50° lat. The Scythians retreated before Darius, avoiding a pitched battle, and using every stratagem to detain the Persians in the country till they should perish from famine." Darius retreated in time to save his army. "Leaving his sick behind, with the campfires lighted and the asses tethered, to make the enemy believe that he was still in their front, he retreated in the night. The pursuing Scythians missed his line of march, and came first to the place where the Ionian ships bridged the Danube. Failing to persuade the Greek generals to break by the same act both the bridge and the yoke of Darius, they marched back to encounter the Persian army. But their own previous destruction of the wells led them into a different route; and Darius got safe, but with difficulty, to the Danube. . . . The Hellespont was crossed by means of the fleet with which the strait had been guarded by Megabazus, or, more probably, Megabyzus; and the second opportunity was barred against a rising of the Greek colonies. . . . He left Megabazus in Europe with 80,000 troops to complete the reduction of all Thrace." Megabazus not only executed this commission, but reduced the kingdom of Macedonia to vassalage before returning to his master, in B. C. 506.—P. Smith, *Ancient Hist. of the East*, bk. 8, ch. 27.—"Darius returned to Susa, leaving the western provinces in profound peace under the government of his brother Artaphernes. A trifling incident lighted the flame of rebellion. One of those political conflicts, which we have seen occurring throughout Greece, broke out in Naxos, an island of the Cyclades (B. C. 502). The exiles of the oligarchical party applied for aid to Aristagoras, the tyrant of Miletus, who persuaded Artaphernes to send an expedition against Naxos. The Persian

commander, incensed by the interference of Aristagoras on a point of discipline, warned the Naxians, and so caused the failure of the expedition and ruined the credit of Aristagoras, who saw no course open to him but revolt. . . . With the consent of the Milesian citizens, Aristagoras seized the tyrants who were on board of the fleet that had returned from Naxos; he laid down his own power; popular governments were proclaimed in all the cities and islands; and Ionia revolted from Darius (B. C. 501). Aristagoras went to Sparta . . . and tried to tempt the king, Cleomenes, by displaying the greatness of the Persian empire; but his admission that Susa was three months' journey from the sea ruined his cause. He had better success at Athens; for the Athenians knew that Artaphernes had been made their enemy by Hippias. They voted twenty ships in aid of the Ionians, and the squadron was increased by five ships of the Eretrians. Having united with the Ionian fleet, they disembarked at Ephesus, marched up the country, and surprised Sardis, which was accidentally burnt during the pillage. Their forces were utterly inadequate to hold the city; and their return was not effected without a severe defeat by the pursuing army. The Athenians reembarked and sailed home, while the Ionians dispersed to their cities to make those preparations which should have preceded the attack. Their powerful fleet gained for them the adhesion of the Hellenistic cities as far as Byantium, of Caria, Caunus, and Cyprus; but this island was recovered by the Persians within a year. The Ionians protracted the insurrection for six years. Their cause was early abandoned by Aristagoras, who fled to the coast of Thrace and there perished. . . . The fate of the revolt turned at last on the siege of Miletus. The city was protected by the Ionian fleet, for which the Phoenician navy of Artaphernes was no match. But there was fatal disunion and want of discipline on board, and the defection of the Samians gave the Persians an easy victory off Ladé (B. C. 495). Miletus suffered the worst honors of a storm, and the other cities and islands were treated with scarcely less severity. This third subjugation of Ionia inflicted the most lasting blow on the prosperity of the colonies (B. C. 493). Throughout his narrative of these events, Herodotus declares his opinion of the impolicy of the interference of the Athenians. The ships they voted, he says, were the beginning of evils both to the Greeks and the barbarians. When the news of the burning of Sardis was brought to Darius, he called for his bow, and shot an arrow towards the sky, with a prayer to Auramazda for help to revenge himself on the Athenians. Then he bade one of his servants repeat to him thrice, as he sat down to dinner, the words, 'Master, remember the Athenians.' Upon the suppression of the Ionian revolt, he appointed his son-in-law Mardonius to succeed Artaphernes, enjoining him to bring these insolent Athenians and Eretrians to Susa."—P. Smith, *Hist. of the World: Ancient*, ch. 13 (v. 1).

Also in: G. Grote, *Hist. of Greece*, pt. 2, ch. 33-35 (v. 4).—C. Thirlwall, *Hist. of Greece*, ch. 14 (v. 2).

B. C. 509.—Alliance solicited, but subjection refused by the Athenians. See ATHENS. B. C. 509-506.

B. C. 492-491.—First expedition against Greece and its failure.—Wrathful preparations of the king for subjugation of the Greeks. See GREECE. B. C. 492-491.

B. C. 490-479.—Wars with the Greeks. See GREECE: B. C. 490, to B. C. 479.

B. C. 486-405.—From Xerxes I. to Artaxerxes II.—The disastrous invasion of Greece.—Loss of Egypt.—Recovery of Asia Minor.—Decay of the empire.—"Xerxes I., who succeeded Darius, B. C. 486, commenced his reign by the reduction of Egypt, B. C. 485, which he entrusted to his brother, Achæmenes. He then provoked and chastised a rebellion of the Babylonians, enriching himself with the plunder of their temples. After this he turned his attention to the invasion of Greece [where he experienced the disastrous defeats of Salamis, Platea, and Mycale—see GREECE. B. C. 480, to B. C. 479].

It was now the turn of the Greeks to retaliate on their prostrate foe. First under the lead of Sparta and then under that of Athens they freed the islands of the Ægean from the Persian yoke, expelled the Persian garrisons from Europe, and even ravaged the Asiatic coast and made descents on it at their pleasure. For twelve years no Persian fleet ventured to dispute with them the sovereignty of the seas, and when at last, in B. C. 466, a naval force was collected to protect Cilicia and Cyprus, it was defeated and destroyed by Cimon at the Eurymedon [see ATHENS. B. C. 470-466]. Soon after this Xerxes' reign came to an end. This weak prince, . . . on his return to Asia, found consolation for his military failure in the delights of the seraglio, and ceased to trouble himself much about affairs of State . . . The bloody and licentious deeds which stain the whole of the later Persian history commence with Xerxes, who suffered the natural penalty of his follies and his crimes when, after reigning twenty years, he was murdered by the captain of his guard, Artabanus, and Aspamitres, his chamberlain . . . Artabanus placed on the throne the youngest son of Xerxes, Artaxerxes I [B. C. 465]. . . The eldest son, Darius, accused by Artabanus of his father's assassination, was executed, the second, Hystaspes, who was satrap of Bactria, claimed the crown, and, attempting to enforce his claim, was defeated and slain in battle. About the same time the crimes of Artabanus were discovered, and he was put to death. Artaxerxes then reigned quietly for nearly forty years. He was a mild prince, possessed of several good qualities, but the weakness of his character caused a rapid declension of the empire under his sway. The revolt of Egypt [B. C. 460-455] was indeed suppressed after a while, through the vigorous measures of the satrap of Syria, Megabyzus; and the Athenians, who had fomented it, were punished by the complete destruction of their fleet, and the loss of almost all their men [see ATHENS. B. C. 460-449]. . . Bent on recovering her prestige, Athens, in B. C. 449, despatched a fleet to the Levant, under Cimon, which sailed to Cyprus and laid siege to Citium. There Cimon died; but the fleet, which had been under his orders, attacked and completely defeated a large Persian armament off Salamis, besides detaching a squadron to assist Amyrtaeus, who still held out in the Delta. Persia, dreading the loss of Cyprus and Egypt, consented to an ignominious peace [the much disputed 'Peace of

Cimon,' or 'Peace of Callias'—see ATHENS: B. C. 460-449]. . . . Scarcely less damaging to Persia was the revolt of Megabyzus, which followed. This powerful noble . . . excited rebellion in Syria [B. C. 447], and so alarmed Artaxerxes that he was allowed to dictate the terms on which he would consent to be reconciled to his sovereign. An example was thus set of successful rebellion on the part of a satrap, which could not but have disastrous consequences. . . . The disorders of the court continued, and indeed increased, under Artaxerxes I, who allowed his mother Amestris, and his sister Amytis, who was married to Megabyzus, to indulge freely the cruelty and licentiousness of their dispositions. Artaxerxes died B. C. 425, and left his crown to his only legitimate son, Xerxes II. Revolutions in the government now succeeded each other with great rapidity. Xerxes II, after reigning forty-five days, was assassinated by his half-brother, Secydianus, or Sogdianus, an illegitimate son of Artaxerxes, who seized the throne, but was murdered in his turn, after a reign of six months and a half, by another brother, Ochus. Ochus, on ascending the throne, took the name of Darius, and is known in history as Darius Nothus. He was married to Parysatis, his aunt, a daughter of Xerxes I, and reigned nineteen years, B. C. 424-405, under her tutelage. His reign . . . was on the whole disastrous. Revolt succeeded to revolt, and, though most of the insurrections were quelled, it was at the cost of what remained of Persian honour and self-respect. Corruption was used instead of force against the rebellious armies. The revolts of satraps were followed by national outbreaks, which, though sometimes quelled, were in other instances successful. In B. C. 408, the Medes, who had patiently acquiesced in Persian rule for more than a century, made an effort to shake off the yoke, but were defeated and reduced to subjection. Three years later, B. C. 405, Egypt once more rebelled, under Nephherites, and succeeded in establishing its independence. The Persians were expelled from Africa, and a native prince seated himself on the throne of the Pharaohs. It was some compensation for this loss, and perhaps for others towards the north and north-east of the empire, that in Asia Minor the authority of the Great King was once more established over the Greek cities. It was the Peloponnesian War, rather than the Peace of Callias, which had prevented any collision between the great powers of Europe and Asia for 87 years. Both Athens and Sparta had their hands full; and though it might have been expected that Persia would have at once taken advantage of the quarrel to reclaim at least her lost continental dominion, yet she seems to have refrained, through moderation or fear, until the Athenian disasters in Sicily encouraged her to make an effort. She then invited the Spartans to Asia, and by the treaties which she concluded with them, and the aid which she gave them, re-acquired without a struggle all the Greek cities of the coast [B. C. 412]. . . . Darius Nothus died B. C. 405, and was succeeded by his eldest son, Arsaces, who on his accession took the name of Artaxerxes. Artaxerxes II, called by the Greeks Mnemon, on account of the excellence of his memory, had from the very first a rival in his brother Cyrus."—G. Rawlinson, *Manual of Ancient Hist.*, bk. 2, sect. 24-39.

Also in: The same, *The Five Great Monarchs*, v. 8: *Persia*, ch. 7.

B. C. 413.—Tribute again demanded from the Greek cities in Asia Minor.—Hostility to Athens.—Subsidies to her enemies. See GREECE: B. C. 418.

B. C. 401-400.—The expedition of Cyrus the Younger, and the Retreat of the Ten Thousand.—Cyrus the Younger, so called to distinguish him from the great founder of the Persian empire, was the second son of Darius Nothus, king of Persia, and expected to succeed his father on the throne through the influence of his mother, Parysatis. During his father's life he was appointed satrap of Lydia, Phrygia and Cappadocia, with supreme military command in all Asia Minor. On the death of Darius, B. C. 404, Cyrus found himself thwarted in his hopes of the succession, and laid plans at once for overthrowing the elder brother, Artaxerxes, who had been placed on the throne. He had acquired an extensive acquaintance with the Greeks and had had much to do with them, in his administration of Asia Minor, during the Peloponnesian War. That acquaintance had produced in his mind a great opinion of their invincible qualities in war, and had shown him the practicability of forming, with the means which he commanded, a compact army of Greek mercenaries which no Persian force could withstand. He executed his plan of gathering such a column of Greek soldiers, without awaking his brother's suspicions, and set out upon his expedition from Sardes to Susa, in March B. C. 401. As he advanced, finding himself unopposed, the troops of Artaxerxes retreating before him, he and his Asiatic followers grew rash in their confidence, and careless of discipline and order. Hence it happened that when the threatened Persian monarch did confront them, with a great army, at Cunaxa, on the Euphrates, in Babylonia, they were taken by surprise and routed, and the pretender, Cyrus, was slain on the field. The Greeks—who numbered about 13,000, but whose ranks were soon thinned and who are famous in history as the Ten Thousand,—stood unshaken and felt still equal to the conquest of the Persian capital, if any object in advancing upon it had remained to them. But the death of Cyrus left them in a strange situation,—deserted by every Asiatic ally, without supplies, without knowledge of the country, in the midst of a hostile population. Their own commander, moreover, had been slain, and no one held authority over them. But they possessed what no other people of their time could claim—the capacity for self-control. They chose from their ranks a general, the Athenian Xenophon, and endowed him with all necessary powers. Then they set their faces homewards, in a long retreat from the lower Euphrates to the Euxine, from the Euxine to the Bosphorus, and so into Greece. “Although this eight months' military expedition possesses no immediate significance for political history, yet it is of high importance, not only for our knowledge of the East, but also for that of the Greek character; and the accurate description which we owe to Xenophon is therefore one of the most valuable documents of antiquity. . . . This army is a typical chart, in many colours, of the Greek population—a picture, on a small scale, of the whole people, with all its virtues and faults, its qualities of strength

and its qualities of weakness, a wandering political community which, according to home usage, holds its assemblies and passes its resolutions, and at the same time a wild and not easily manageable band of free-lances. . . . And how very remarkable it is, that in this mixed multitude of Greeks it is an Athenian who by his qualities towers above all the rest, and becomes the real preserver of the entire army! The Athenian Xenophon had only accompanied the expedition as a volunteer, having been introduced by Proxenus to Cyrus, and thereupon moved by his sense of honour to abide with the man whose great talents he admired. . . . The Athenian alone possessed that superiority of culture which was necessary for giving order and self-control to the band of warriors, barbarized by their selfish life, and for enabling him to serve them in the greatest variety of situations as spokesman, as general, and as negotiator; and to him it was essentially due that, in spite of their unspeakable trials, through hostile tribes and desolate snow-ranges, 8,000 Greeks after all, by wanderings many and devious, in the end reached the coast. They fancied themselves safe when, at the beginning of March, they had reached the sea at Trapezus. But their greatest difficulties were only to begin here, where they first again came into contact with Greeks.” Sparta, then supreme in Greece, feared to offend the Great King by showing any friendliness to this fugitive remnant of the unfortunate expedition of Cyrus. The gates of her cities were coldly shut against them, and they were driven to enter the service of a Thracian prince, in order to obtain subsistence. But another year found Sparta involved in war with Persia, and the surviving Cyrenians, as they came to be called, were then summoned to Asia Minor for a new campaign against the enemy they hated most.—E. Curtius, *Hist. of Greece*, bk. 5, ch. 3.

Also in: G. Grote, *Hist. of Greece*, ch. 69-71.

—Xenophon, *Anabasis*.

B. C. 399-387.—War with Sparta.—Alliance with Athens, Thebes, Corinth and Argos.—The Peace of Antalcidas.—Recovery of Ionian cities. See GREECE: B. C. 399-387.

B. C. 366.—Intervention in Greece solicited by Thebes.—The Great King's rescript. See GREECE: B. C. 371-362.

B. C. 337-336.—Preparations for invasion by Philip of Macedonia. See GREECE: B. C. 357-336.

B. C. 334-330.—Conquest by Alexander the Great. See MACEDONIA &c: B. C. 334-330.

B. C. 323-150.—Under the Successors of Alexander.—In the empire of the Seleucids. See MACEDONIA: B. C. 323-316; and SELEUCIDÆ.

B. C. 150-A. D. 226.—Embraced in the Parthian empire.—Recovery of national independence.—Rise of the Sassanian monarchy.—“About B. C. 163, an energetic [Parthian] prince, Mithridates I., commenced a series of conquests towards the West, which terminated (about B. C. 150) in the transference from the Syro-Macedonian to the Parthian rule of Media Magna, Susiana, Persia, Babylonia, and Assyria Proper. It would seem that the Persians offered no resistance to the progress of the new conqueror. . . . The treatment of the Persians by their Parthian lords seems, on the whole, to have been marked by moderation. . . . It was a principle of the Parthian governmental system to allow the subject peoples, to a large extent,

to govern themselves. These people generally, and notably the Persians, were ruled by native kings, who succeeded to the throne by hereditary right, had the full power of life and death, and ruled very much as they pleased, so long as they paid regularly the tribute imposed upon them by the 'King of Kings,' and sent him a respectable contingent when he was about to engage in a military expedition."—G. Rawlinson, *The Seventh Great Oriental Monarchy*, ch. 1.—"The formidable power of the Parthians . . . was in its turn subverted by Ardshir, or Artaxerxes, the founder of a new dynasty, which, under the name of Sassanides [see SASSANIAN DYNASTY], governed Persia till the invasion of the Arabs. This great revolution, whose fatal influence was soon experienced by the Romans, happened in the fourth year of Alexander Severus [A. D. 226]. . . . Artaxerxes had served with great reputation in the armies of Artaban, the last king of the Parthians; and it appears that he was driven into exile and rebellion by royal ingratitude, the customary reward for superior merit. His birth was obscure, and the obscurity equally gave room to the aspersions of his enemies and the battery of his adherents. If we credit the scandal of the former, Artaxerxes sprang from the illegitimate commerce of a tanner's wife with a common soldier. The latter represents him as descended from a branch of the ancient kings of Persia. . . . As the lineal heir of the monarchy, he asserted his right to the throne, and challenged the noble task of delivering the Persians from the oppression under which they groaned above five centuries, since the death of Darius. The Parthians were defeated in three great battles. In the last of these their king Artaban was slain, and the spirit of the nation was for ever broken. The authority of Artaxerxes was solemnly acknowledged in a great assembly held at Balkh in Khorasan."—E. Gibbon, *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, ch. 8 (v. 1).

A. D. 226-627.—Wars with the Romans.—The revolution in Asia which subverted the Parthian empire and brought into existence a new Persian monarchy—the monarchy of the Sassanides—occurred A. D. 226. The founder of the new throne, Artaxerxes, no sooner felt firm in his seat than he sent an imposing embassy to bear to the Roman emperor—then Alexander Severus—his haughty demand that all Asia should be yielded to him and that Roman arms and Roman authority should be withdrawn to the western shores of the Ægean and the Propontis. This was the beginning of a series of wars, extending through four centuries and ending only with the Mahometan conquests which swept Roman and Persian power, alike, out of the contested field. The first campaigns of the Romans against Artaxerxes were of doubtful result. In the reign of Sapor, son of Artaxerxes, the war was renewed, with unprecedented humiliation and disaster to the Roman arms. Valerian, the emperor, was surrounded and taken prisoner, after a bloody battle fought near Edessa (A. D. 260),—remaining until his death a captive in the hands of his insolent conqueror and subjected to every indignity (see ROME: A. D. 192-284). Syria was overrun by the Persian armies, and its splendid capital, Antioch, surprised, pillaged, and savagely wrecked, while the inhabitants were mostly slain or reduced to slavery. Cilicia and Cappadocia were next devastated in like manner.

Caesarea; the Cappadocian capital, being taken after an obstinate siege, suffered pillage and unmerciful massacre. The victorious career of Sapor, which Rome failed to arrest, was checked by the rising power of Palmyra (see PALMYRA). Fifteen years later, Aurelian, who had destroyed Palmyra, was marching to attack Persia when he fell by the hands of domestic enemies and traitors. It was not until A. D. 283, in the reign of Carus, that Rome and Persia crossed swords again. Carus ravaged Mesopotamia, captured Seleucia and Ctesiphon and passed beyond the Tigris, when he met with a mysterious death and his victorious army retreated. A dozen years passed before the quarrel was taken up again, by Diocletian (see ROME: A. D. 284-305). That vigorous monarch sent one of his Caesars—Galerius—into the field, while he stationed himself at Antioch to direct the war. In his first campaign (A. D. 297), Galerius was defeated, on the old fatal field of Carrhae. In his second campaign (A. D. 297-298) he won a decisive victory and forced on the Persian king, Narses, a humiliating treaty, which renounced Mesopotamia, ceded five provinces beyond the Tigris, made the Araxes, or Aboras, the boundary between the two empires, and gave other advantages to the Romans. There was peace, then, for forty years, until another Sapor, grandson of Narses, had mounted the Persian throne. Constantine the Great was dead and his divided empire seemed less formidable to the neighboring power. "During the long period of the reign of Constantius [A. D. 337-361] the provinces of the East were afflicted by the calamities of the Persian war. . . . The armies of Rome and Persia encountered each other in nine bloody fields, in two of which Constantius himself commanded in person. The event of the day was most commonly adverse to the Romans." In the great battle of Singara, fought A. D. 348, the Romans were victors at first, but allowed themselves to be surprised at night, while plundering the enemy's camp, and were routed with great slaughter. Three sieges of Nisibis, in Mesopotamia—the bulwark of Roman power in the East—were among the memorable incidents of these wars. In 338, in 346, and again in 350, it repulsed the Persian king with shame and loss. Less fortunate was the city of Amida [modern Diarbekir], in Armenia, besieged by Sapor, in 359. It was taken, at the last, by storm, and the inhabitants put to the sword. On the accession of Julian, the Persian war was welcomed by the ambitious young emperor as an opportunity for emulating the glory of Alexander, after rivalling that of Caesar in Gaul. In the early spring of 363, he led forth a great army from Antioch, and traversed the sandy plains of Mesopotamia to the Persian capital of Ctesiphon, reducing and destroying the strong cities of Perisabor and Maogamalcha on his march. Finding Ctesiphon too strong in its fortifications to encourage a siege, he crossed the Tigris, burned his fleet and advanced boldly into the hostile country beyond. It was a fatal expedition. Led astray by perfidious guides, harassed by a swarm of enemies, and scantily supplied with provisions, the Romans were soon forced to an almost desperate retreat. If Julian had lived, he might possibly have sustained the courage of his men and rescued them from their situation; but he fell, mortally wounded, in repelling one of the incessant attacks of the Persian

cavalry. An officer named Jovian was then hastily proclaimed emperor, and by his agency an ignominious treaty was arranged with the Persian king. It gave up all the conquests of Galerius, together with Nisibis, Singara and other Roman strongholds in Mesopotamia, on which hard terms the Roman army was permitted to recross the Tigris and find refuge in regions of its own. The peace thus shamefully purchased endured for more than half a century. Religious fanaticism kindled war afresh, A. D. 422, between Persia and the eastern empire; but the events are little known. It seems to have resulted, practically, in the division of Armenia which gave Lesser Armenia to the Romans as a province and made the Greater Armenia, soon afterwards, a Persian satrapy, called Persarmenia. The truce which ensued was respected for eighty years. In the year 502, while Anastasius reigned at Constantinople and Kobad was king of Persia, there was a recurrence of war, which ended, however, in 505, without any territorial changes. The unhappy city of Amida was again captured in this war, after a siege of three months, and 80,000 of its inhabitants perished under the Persian swords. Preparatory to future conflicts, Anastasius now founded and Justinian afterwards strengthened the powerfully fortified city of Dara, near Nisibis. The value of the new outpost was put to the proof in 526, when hostilities again broke out. The last great Roman general, Belisarius, was in command at Dara during the first years of this war, and finally held the general command. In 529 he fought a great battle in front of Dara and won a decisive victory. The next year he suffered a defeat at Sura and in 532 the two powers arranged a treaty of peace which they vauntingly called "The Endless Peace", but Justinian (who was now emperor) paid 11,000 pounds of gold for it. "The Endless Peace" was so quickly ended that the year 540 found the Persian king Chosroes, or Nushirvan, at the head of an army in Syria ravaging the country and despoiling the cities Antioch, just restored by Justinian, after an earthquake which, in 526, had nearly levelled it with the ground, was stormed, pillaged, half burned, and its streets drenched with blood. The seat of war was soon transferred to the Caucasian region of Colchis, or Lazica (modern Mingrelia), and became what is known in history as the Lazic War [see LAZICA], which was protracted until 561, when Justinian consented to a treaty which pledged the empire to pay 30,000 pieces of gold annually to the Persian king, while the latter surrendered his claim to Colchis. But war broke out afresh in 572 and continued till 591, when the armies of the Romans restored to the Persian throne another Chosroes, grandson of the first, who had fled to them from a rebellion which deposed and destroyed his unworthy father. Twelve years later this Chosroes became the most formidable enemy to the empire that it had encountered in the East. In successive campaigns he stripped from it Syria and Palestine, Egypt, Cyrenaica, and the greater part of Asia Minor, even to the shores of the Bosphorus. Taking the city of Chalcedon in 616, after a lengthy siege, he established a camp and army at that post, within sight of Constantinople, and held it for ten years, insulting and threatening the imperial capital. But he found a worthy antagonist in Heraclius, who became emperor of the

Roman East in 610, and who proved himself to be one of the greatest of soldiers. It was twelve years after the beginning of his reign before Heraclius could gather in hand, from the shrunken and exhausted empire, such resources as would enable him to turn aggressively upon the Persian enemy. Then, in three campaigns, between 622 and 627, he completely reversed the situation. After a decisive battle, fought December 1, A. D. 627, on the very site of ancient Nineveh, the royal city of Dastagerd was taken and spoiled, and the king, stripped of all his conquests and his glory, was a fugitive (see ROME: A. D. 565-628). A conspiracy and an assassination soon ended his career and his son made peace. It was a lasting peace, ~~but~~ between Romans and Persians; for eight years afterwards the Persians were in their death struggle with the warriors of Mahomet.—G. Rawlinson, *The Seventh Great Oriental Monarchy*.

Also in, E. Gibbon, *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, ch. 18. 24-25, 40, 42, 46.

A. D. 632-651.—Mahometan Conquest. See MAHOMETAN CONQUEST A. D. 632-651.

A. D. 901-998.—The Samanide and Bouide dynasties. See SAMANIDES; and MAHOMETAN CONQUEST A. D. 815-945.

A. D. 999-1038.—Under the Gaznevides. See TURKS A. D. 999-1183.

A. D. 1050-1193.—Under the Seljuk Turks. See TURKS (SELJUK): 1004-1063, and after.

A. D. 1150-1250.—The period of the Atabegs. See ATABEGS.

A. D. 1193.—Conquest by the Khuarezmians. See KUAREZM: 12TH CENTURY.

A. D. 1220-1226.—Conquest by Jingiz Khan. See MONGOLS A. D. 1153-1227, and KHORASAN A. D. 1220-1221.

A. D. 1258-1393.—The Mongol empire of the Ilkhans.—Khulagu, or Houlagou, grandson of Jingiz Khan, who extinguished the caliphate at Bagdad, A. D. 1258, and completed the Mongol conquest of Persia and Mesopotamia (see BAGDAD A. D. 1258), "received the investiture of his conquests and of the country south of the Oxus. He founded an empire there, known as that of the Ilkhans. Like the Khans of the Golden Horde, the successors of Batu, they for a long time acknowledged the suzerainty of the Khan of the Mongols in the East."—H. H. Howorth, *Hist. of the Mongols*, pt. 1, p. 211.—Khulagu "fixed his residence at Maragha, in Aderbijan, a beautiful town, situated on a fine plain watered by a small but pure stream, which, rising in the high mountains of Sahund, flows past the walls of the city, and empties itself in the neighbouring lake of Oormia. . . . At this delightful spot Hulakoo [or Khulagu] appears to have employed his last years in a manner worthy of a great monarch. Philosophers and astronomers were assembled from every part of his dominions, who laboured in works of science under the direction of his favourite, Nasser-udeen." The title of the Ilkhans, given to Khulagu and his successors, signified simply the lords or chiefs (the Khans). Their empire was extinguished in 1393 by the conquests of Timour.—Sir J. Malcolm, *Hist. of Persia*, ch. 10 (v. 1).—"It was under Sultan Ghazan, who reigned from 1294 to 1308, that Mahometanism again became the established religion of Persia. In the second year of his reign, Ghazan Khan publicly declared his conversion to the faith of the Koran.

After Sultan Ghazan the power of the Mongolian dynasty in Persia rapidly declined. The empire soon began to break in pieces. The royal house became extinct while another branch of the descendants of Hulaku established themselves at Bagdad. At last Persia became a mere scene of anarchy and confusion, utterly incapable of offering any serious resistance to the greatest of Mussulman conquerors, the invincible and merciless Timour" — E. A. Freeman, *Hist. and Cong. of the Saracens*, loc. 6

A. D. 1386-1393.—Conquest by Timour. See TIMOUR

A. D. 1499-1887.—The founding of the Safavean dynasty.—Triumph of the Sheahs—Subjugation by the Afghans.—Deliverance by Nadir Shah.—The Khajar dynasty.—"At an early period in the rise of Islamism, the followers of Mohammed became divided on the question of the succession to the caliphate, or leadership, vacated by the death of Mohammed. Some, who were in majority, believed that it lay with the descendants of the caliph, Moawiyeh while others as firmly clung to the opinion that the succession lay with the sons of Alee and Fatimah, the daughter of the prophet, Hassan and Houssein and their descendants. In a desperate conflict on the banks of the Euphrates nearly all the male descendants of the prophet were slain [see MAHOMMEDAN CONQUEST &c A. D. 680] and almost the entire Mohammedan peoples, from India to Spain thenceforward became Sunnees—that is they embraced belief in the succession of the line of the house of Moawiyeh, called the Ommades. But there was an exception to this uniformity of belief. The Persians, as has been seen, were a people deeply given to religious beliefs and mystical speculations to the point of fanaticism. Without any apparent reason many of them became Sheahs [or Shi'ahs], or believers in the claims of the house of Alee and Fatimah [see ISLAM]. Naturally for centuries the Sheahs suffered much persecution from the Sunnees as the rulers of Persia, until the 15th century were generally Sunnees. But this only stimulated the burning zeal of the Sheahs, and in the end resulted in bringing about the independence of Persia under a dynasty of her own race. In the 14th century there resided at Ardebil a priest named the Sheikh Saifus, who was held in the highest repute for his holy life. He was a lineal descendant of Musa, the seventh Holy Imam. His son, Sadr ud-Deen, not only enjoyed a similar fame for piety, but used it to such good account as to become chieftain of the province where he lived, Junaid, the grandson of Sadr ud-Deen, had three sons, of whom the youngest, named Ismail, was born about the year 1480. When only eighteen years of age, the young Ismail entered the province of Ghilan, on the shores of the Caspian, and by the sheer force of genius raised a small army, with which he captured Baku. His success brought recruits to his standard, and at the head of 16,000 men he defeated the chieftain of Alamut, the general sent against him, and, marching on Tabreez, seized it without a blow. In 1499 Ismail, the founder of the Safavean dynasty, was proclaimed Shah of Persia. Since that period, with the exception of the brief invasion of Mahmood the Afghan, Persia has been an independent and at times a very powerful nation. The establishment of the

Safavean dynasty also brought about the existence of a Sheah government, and gave great strength to that sect of the Mohammedans, between whom and other Islamites there was always great bitterness and much bloodshed. Ismail speedily carried his sway as far as the Tigris in the southwest and to Kharism and Candahar in the north and east. He lost one great battle with the Turks under Selim II at Tabreez [or Chaldiran—see TURKS A. D. 1481-1520], but with honor, as the Persians were outnumbered, but it is said he was so cast down by that evnt he never was seen to smile again. He died in 1524 leaving the record of a glorious reign. His three immediate successors, Tahmasp, Ismail II, and Mohammed Khudabanda, did little to sustain the fame and power of their country, and the new empire must soon have yielded to the attacks of its enemies at home and abroad, if a prince of extraordinary ability had not succeeded to the throne when the new dynasty seemed on the verge of ruin. Shah Abbas, called the Great, was crowned in the year 1580, and died in 1628, at the age of seventy, after a reign of forty two years [see TURKS A. D. 1623-1640]. This monarch was one of the greatest sovereigns who ever sat on the throne of Persia. It was the misfortune of Persia that the Safavean line rapidly degenerated after the death of Shah Abbas. Taking advantage of the low state of the Safavean dynasty, Mahmood, an Afghan chieftain invaded Persia in 1722 with an army of 50,000 men. Such was the condition of the empire that he had little difficulty in capturing Ispahan, although it had a population of 600,000. He slaughtered every male member of the royal family except Houssem the weak sovereign, his son Tahmasp, and two grandchildren; all the artists of Ispahan and scores of thousands besides were slain. That magnificent capital has never recovered from the blow. Mahmood died in 1725 and was succeeded by his cousin Ashraf. But the brief rule of the Afghans terminated in 1727. Nadir Kuli, a Persian soldier of fortune or in other words a brigand of extraordinary ability joined Tahmasp II, who had escaped and collected a small force in the north of Persia. Nadir marched on Ispahan and defeated the Afghans in several battles. Ashraf was slain and Tahmasp II was crowned. But Nadir dethroned Tahmasp II in 1732, being a man of vast ambition as well as desire to increase the renown of Persia, and he caused that unfortunate sovereign to be made way with some years later. Soon after Nadir Kuli proclaimed himself king of Persia with the title of Nadir Kuli Khan. Nadir was a man of ability equal to his ambition. He not only beat the Turks with comparative ease, but he organized an expedition that conquered Afghanistan and proceeded eastward until Delhi fell into his hands, with immense slaughter [see INDIA: A. D. 1682-1748]. He was assassinated in 1747. Nadir Kuli Khan was a man of great genius, but he died too soon to establish an enduring dynasty, and after his death civil wars rapidly succeeded each other until the rise of the present or Khajar dynasty, which succeeded the reign of the good Kerim Khan the Zead, who reigned twenty years at Shiraz. Aga Mohammed Khan, the founder of the Khajar dynasty, succeeded in 1794 in crushing the last pretender to the throne, after a terrible civil war, and once more

reunited the provinces of Persia under one sceptre. . . . Aga Mohammed Khan was succeeded, after his assassination, by his nephew Feth Alee Shah, a monarch of good disposition and some ability. It was his misfortune to be drawn into two wars with Russia, who stripped Persia of her Circassian provinces, notwithstanding the stout resistance made by the Persian armies. Feth Alee Shah was succeeded by his grandson Mohammed Shah, a sovereign of moderate talents. No events of unusual interest mark his reign, excepting the siege of Herat which was captured in the present reign from the Afghans. He died in 1848, and was succeeded by his son Nasr-ed-Deen Shah, the present [1887] sovereign of Persia."—S. G. W. Benjamin, *The Story of Persia*, ch. 20.

ALSO IN: C. R. Markham, *General Sketch of the Hist. of Persia*, ch. 10-20.—Sir J. Malcolm, *Hist. of Persia*, ch. 12-20 (v. 1-2)—R. G. Watson, *Hist. of Persia*, 1800-1858.

A. D. 1894.—The reigning Shah.—Nasr-ed-Deen is still, in 1894, the reigning sovereign. He is blessed with a family of four sons and fifteen daughters.

PERSIAN SIBYL. See SIBYLS

PERSIANS, Education of the ancient. See EDUCATION, ANCIENT

PERSONAL LIBERTY LAWS. See UNITED STATES OF AM. A. D. 1860 (DECEMBER) PRESIDENT BUCHANAN'S SURRENDER

PERTH: A. D. 1559.—The Reformation Riot. See SCOTLAND A. D. 1558-1560

A. D. 1715.—Headquarters of the Jacobite Rebellion. See SCOTLAND A. D. 1715

PERTH, The Five Articles of. See SCOTLAND, A. D. 1618

PERTINAX, Roman Emperor, A. D. 193

PERU: Origin of the name.—"There was a chief in the territory to the south of the Gulf of San Miguel, on the Pacific coast, named Biru, and this country was visited by Gaspar de Morales and Francisco Pizarro in 1515. For the next ten years Biru was the most southern land known to the Spaniards; and the consequence was that the unknown regions farther south, including the rumored empire abounding in gold, came to be designated as Biru, or Peru. It was thus that the land of the Yncas got the name of Peru from the Spaniards, some years before it was actually discovered."—C. R. Markham, *Narrative and Critical Hist. of Am.*, v. 2, ch. 8.

ALSO IN: A. Helps, *Spanish Conquest in America*, bk. 6, ch. 2.

The aboriginal inhabitants and their civilization.—The extraordinary paternal despotism of the Incas.—"The bulk of the population [of Peru] is composed of the aboriginal Indians, the natives who had been there from time immemorial when America was discovered. The central tribe of these Indians was that of the Yucas, inhabiting the region in the Sierra which has already been described as the Cuzco section. Such a country was well adapted for the cradle of an imperial tribe. . . . The Ynca race was originally divided into six tribes, whose lands are indicated by the rivers which formed their limits. Of these tribes the Yncas themselves had their original seat between the rivers Apuri-

mac and Paucartampu, with the lovely valley of the Vilcamayu bisecting it. The Canas dwelt in the upper part of that valley up to the Vilcañota Pass, and on the mountains on either side. The Quichuas were in the valleys round the head waters of the Apurimac and Abancay. The Chancas extended from the neighbourhood of Ayacucho (Guamanga) to the Apurimac. The Huancas occupied the valley of the Xauxa up to the saddle of the Cerro Pasco, and the Rucanas were in the mountainous region between the central and western cordilleras. These six tribes eventually formed the conquering Ynca race. Their language was introduced into every conquered province, and was carefully taught to the people, so that the Spaniards correctly called it the 'Lengua General' of Peru. This language was called Quichua, after the tribe inhabiting the upper part of the valleys of the Pachachaca and Apurimac. Their territory consisted chiefly of uplands covered with long grass, and the name has been derived from the abundance of straw in this region. 'Quehuani' is to twist; 'quehuasca' is the participle, and 'ychu' is straw. Together, 'Quehuasca-Ychu,' or twisted straw, abbreviated into Quichua. The name was given to the language by Friar San Tomas in his grammar published in 1560, who perhaps first collected words among the Quichuas and so gave it their name, which was adopted by all subsequent grammarians. But the proper name would have been the Ynca language. The aboriginal people in the basin of Lake Titicaca were called Collas, and they spoke a language which is closely allied to the Quichua. . . . The Collas were conquered by the Yncas in very remote times, and their language, now incorrectly called Aymara, received many Quichua additions; for it originally contained few words to express abstract ideas, and none for many things which are indispensable in the first beginnings of civilized life. One branch of the Collas (now called Aymaras) was a savage tribe inhabiting the shores and islands of Lake Titicaca, called Urus. The Ynca and Colla (Aymara) tribes eventually combined to form the great armies which spread the rule of Ynca sovereigns over a much larger extent of country. . . . In the happy days of the Yncas they cultivated many of the arts, and had some practical knowledge of astronomy. They had domesticated all the animals in their country capable of domestication, understood mining and the working of metals, excelled as masons, weavers, dyers, and potters, and were good farmers. They brought the science of administration to a high pitch of perfection, and composed imaginative songs and dramas of considerable merit. . . . The coast of Peru was inhabited by a people entirely different from the Indians of the Sierra. There are some slight indications of the aborigines having been a diminutive race of fishermen who were driven out by the more civilized people, called Yuncas. . . . The Yncas conquered the coast valleys about a century before the discovery of America, and the Spaniards completed the destruction of the Yuncas people."—C. R. Markham, *Peru*, ch. 8.—"In the minuter mechanical arts, both [the Aztecs of Mexico and the Incas of Peru] showed considerable skill; but in the construction of important public works, of roads, aqueducts, canals, and in agriculture in all its details, the Peruvians were much superior.

Strange that they should have fallen so far below their rivals in their efforts after a higher intellectual culture, in astronomical science, more especially, and in the art of communicating thought by visible symbols . . . We shall look in vain in the history of the East for a parallel to the absolute control exercised by the Incas over their subjects . . . It was a theocracy more potent in its operation than that of the Jews, for, though the sanction of the law might be as great among the latter, the law was expounded by a human lawgiver, the servant and representative of Divinity. But the Inca was both the lawgiver and the law. He was not merely the representative of Divinity, or, like the Pope, its vicegerent, but he was Divinity itself. The violation of his ordinance was sacrilege. Never was there a scheme of government enforced by such terrible sanctions, or which bore so oppressively on the subjects of it. For it reached not only to the visible acts, but to the private conduct, the words, the very thoughts of its vassals . . . Under this extraordinary polity, a people advanced in many of the social refinements, well skilled in manufactures and agriculture, were unacquainted . . . with money. They had nothing that deserved to be called property. They could follow no craft, could engage in no labor, no amusement, but such as was specially provided by law. They could not change their residence or their dress without a license from the government. They could not even exercise the freedom which is conceded to the most abject in other countries, that of selecting their own wives. The imperative spirit of despotism would not allow them to be happy or miserable in any way but that established by law. The power of free agency—the inestimable and inborn right of every human being—was annihilated in Peru."—W. H. Prescott, *Hist. of the Conquest of Peru*, bk 1, ch 5 (v 1).

ALSO IN: *The Standard Natural Hist.* (J. S. Kingsley, ed.), v. 6, pp. 215-226—J. Fiske, *The Discovery of America*, ch. 9 (v. 2)—E. J. Payne, *Hist. of the New World called America*, bk 2 (v. 1).

—See, also, AMERICAN ABORIGINES, ANDESIANS.

The empire of the Incas.—"The Inca empire had attained its greatest extension and power precisely at the period of the discovery by Columbus, under the reign of Huayna Capac, who, rather than Huascar or Atahualpa, should be called the last of the Incas. His father, the Inca Tupac Yúpanqui, had pushed his conquests on the south, beyond the great desert of Atacama, to the river Maule in Chili; while, at the same time, Huayna Capac himself had reduced the powerful and refined kingdom of the Sciris of Quito [see ECUADOR], on the north. From their great dominating central plateau, the Incas had pressed down to the Pacific, on the one hand, and to the dense forests of the Amazonian valleys on the other. Throughout this wide region and over all its nations, principalities, and tribes, Huayna Capac at the beginning of the 16th century ruled supreme. His empire extended from four degrees above the equator to the 84th southern parallel of latitude, a distance of not far from 8,000 miles; while from east to west it spread, with varying width, from the Pacific to the valleys of Paucartambo and Chuquisaca, an average distance of not far from 400 miles, covering an area, therefore, of more than one million square miles, equal to about one-third of the total area

of the United States, or to the whole of the United States to the eastward of the Mississippi River . . . In the islands of Lake Titicaca, if tradition be our guide, were developed the germs of Inca civilization. Thence, it is said, went the founders of the Inca dynasty, past the high divide between the waters flowing into the lake and those falling into the Amazon, and skirting the valley of the river Vilcanota for more than 200 miles, they established their seat in the bolson [valley] of Cuzco . . . It is not only central in position, salubrious and productive, but the barriers which separate it from the neighboring valleys are relatively low, with passes which may be traversed with comparative ease; while they are, at the same time, readily defensible. The rule of the first Inca seems not to have extended beyond this valley, and the passes leading into it are strongly fortified, showing the direction whence hostilities were anticipated in the early days of the empire, before the chiefs of Cuzco began their career of conquest and aggregation, reducing the people of the bolson of Anta in the north, and that of Urus in the south.

The survey of the monuments of Peru brings the conviction that the ancient population was not nearly so numerous as the accounts of the chroniclers would lead us to suppose. From what I have said, it will be clear that but a small portion of the country is inhabitable, or capable of supporting a considerable number of people. The rich and productive valleys and bolsones are hardly more than specks on the map, and although there is every evidence that their capacities of production were taxed to the very utmost, still their capacities were limited. The ancient inhabitants built their dwellings among rough rocks, on arid slopes of hills, and walled up their dead in caves and clefts, or buried them among irreclaimable sands, in order to utilize the scanty cultivable soil for agriculture. They excavated great areas in the deserts until they reached moisture enough to support vegetation, and then brought guano from the islands to fertilize these sunken gardens. They terraced up every hill and mountain-side, and gathered the soil from the crevices of the rocks to fill the narrow platforms, until not a foot of surface, on which could grow a single stalk of maize or a single handful of quinoa, was left uninproved. China, perhaps Japan and some portions of India, may afford a parallel to the extreme utilization of the soil which was effected in Peru at the time of the Inca Empire. No doubt the Indian population lived, as it still lives, on the scantiest fare, on the very minimum of food, but it had not then, as now, the ox, the hog, the goat, and the sheep, nor yet many of the grains and fruits which contribute most to the support of dense populations.

. . . The present population of the three states which were wholly or in part included in the Inca Empire—namely, Ecuador, Peru and Bolivia—does not exceed five millions. I think it would be safe to estimate the population under the Inca rule at about double that number, or perhaps somewhere between ten and twelve millions; notwithstanding Las Casas, the good, but not very accurate, Bishop of Chiapa tells us that, "in the Province of Peru alone the Spaniards killed above forty millions of people,"—E. G. Squier, *Peru*, ch. 1.

■ A. D. 1527-1528.—Discovery by the Spaniards. See AMERICA: A. D. 1524-1528.

A. D. 1528-1531.—The commission and the preparations of Pizarro.—“In the spring of 1528, Pizarro and one of his comrades taking with them some natives of Peru and some products of that country, set out [from Panama] to tell their tale at the court of Castile. Pizarro . . . found the Emperor Charles V. at Toledo, and met with a gracious reception . . . His tales of the wealth which he had witnessed were the more readily believed in consequence of the experiences of another Spaniard whom he now met at court, the famous conqueror of Mexico. Yet affairs in Spain progressed with proverbial slowness, and it was not until the expiry of a year from the date of his arrival in the country that the capitulation was signed defining the powers of Pizarro. By this agreement he was granted the right of discovery and conquest in Peru, or New Castile, with the titles of Captain general of the province and Adelantado, or lieutenant-governor. He was likewise to enjoy a considerable salary, and to have the right to erect certain fortresses under his government, and, in short, to exercise the prerogatives of a viceroy. Almagro was merely appointed commander of the fortress of Tumbez, with the rank of *hidalgo*, whilst Father Luque became bishop of the same place. Pizarro, on his part, was bound to raise within six months force of 250 men, whilst the government on theirs engaged to furnish some assistance in the purchase of artillery and stores.” Thus commissioned, Pizarro left Seville in January, 1530, hastening back to Panama, accompanied or followed by four half-brothers, who were destined to stormy careers in Peru. Naturally his comrade and partner Almagro was ill pleased with the provision made for him, and the partnership came near to wreck, but some sort of reconciliation was brought about, and the two adventurers joined hands again in preparations for a second visit to Peru, with intentions boding evil to the unhappy natives of that too bountiful land. It was early in January 1531 that Pizarro sailed southward from the Isthmus for the third and last time.—R. G. Watson, *Spanish and Portuguese South Am.*, v. 1, ch. 6-7.

A. D. 1531-1533.—Pizarro's conquest.—Treacherous murder of Atahualpa.—“Pizarro sailed from Panama on the 28th of December, 1531, with three small vessels carrying one hundred and eighty three men and thirty-seven horses. In thirteen days he arrived at the bay of San Mateo, where he landed the horses and soldiers to march along the shore, sending back the ships to get more men and horses at Panama and Nicaragua. They returned with twenty-six horses and thirty more men. With this force Pizarro continued his march along the sea coast, which was well peopled, and on arriving at the bay of Guayaquil, he crossed over in the ships to the island of Puna. Here a devastating war was waged with the unfortunate natives, and from Puna the conqueror proceeded again in his ships to the Peruvian town of Tumbez. The country was in a state of confusion, owing to a long and desolating war of succession between Huascar and Atahualpa, the two sons of the great Ynca Huayna Capac, and was thus an easy prey to the invaders. Huascar had been defeated and made prisoner by the generals of his brother, and Atahualpa was on his way from Quito to Cusco, the capital of the empire, to enjoy the

fruits of his victory. He was reported to be at Caxamarca, on the eastern side of the mountain, and Pizarro, with his small force, set out from Tumbez on the 18th of May, 1532. . . . The first part of Pizarro's march was southward from Tumbez, in the rainless coast region. After crossing a vast desert he came to Tangarara, in the fertile valleys of the Chira, where he founded the city of San Miguel, the site of which was afterwards removed to the valley of Piura. The accountant Antonio Navarro and the royal treasurer Riquelme were left in command at San Miguel, and Pizarro resumed his march in search of the Ynca Atahualpa on the 24th of September, 1532. He detached the gallant cavalier, Hernando de Soto, into the sierra of Huancabamba, to reconnoitre, and pacify the country. De Soto rejoined the main body after an absence of about ten days. The brother of Atahualpa, named Titu Atachi, arrived as an envoy, with presents, and a message to the effect that the Ynca desired friendship with the strangers. Crossing the vast desert of Sechura, Pizarro reached the fertile valley of Motupe, and marched thence to the foot of the cordilleras in the valley of the Jequetepeque. Here he rested for a day or two, to arrange the order for the ascent. He took with him forty horses and sixty foot, instructing Hernando de Soto to follow him with the main body and the baggage. News arrived that the Ynca Atahualpa had reached the neighborhood of Caxamarca about three days before, and that he desired peace. Pizarro pressed forward, crossed the cordillera, and on Friday, the 15th of November, 1532, he entered Caxamarca with his whole force. Here he found excellent accommodation in the large masonry buildings, and was well satisfied with the strategic position. Atahualpa was established in a large camp outside, where Hernando de Soto had an interview with him. Atahualpa announced his intention of visiting the Christian commander, and Pizarro arranged and perpetrated a black act of treachery. He kept all his men under arms. The Ynca, suspecting nothing, came into the great square of Cusco in grand regal procession. He was suddenly attacked and made prisoner, and his people were massacred. The Ynca offered a ransom, which he described as gold enough to fill a room twenty-two feet long and seventeen wide, to a height equal to a man's stature and a half. He undertook to do this in two months, and sent orders for the collection of golden vases and ornaments in all parts of the empire. Soon the treasure began to arrive, while Atahualpa was deceived by false promises, and he beguiled his captivity by acquiring Spanish and learning to play at chess and cards. Meanwhile Pizarro sent an expedition under his brother Hernando, to visit the famous temple of Pachacamac on the coast; and three soldiers were also despatched to Cusco, the capital of the empire, to hurry forward the treasure. They set out in February, 1533, but behaved with so much imprudence and insolence at Cusco as to endanger their own lives and the success of their mission. Pizarro therefore ordered two officers of distinction, Hernando de Soto and Pedro del Barco, to follow them and remedy the mischief which they were doing. On Easter eve, being the 14th of April, 1533, Almagro arrived at Caxamarca with a reinforcement of 150 Spaniards and 84 horses. On the 3rd of May it was ordered

that the gold already arrived should be melted down for distribution; but another large instalment came on the 14th of June. An immense quantity consisted of slabs, with holes at the corners, which had been torn off the walls of temples and palaces; and there were vessels and ornaments of all shapes and sizes. After the royal fifth had been deducted, the rest was divided among the conquerors. The total sum of 4,005,670 ducats would be equal to about £3,500,000 of modern money. After the partition of the treasure, the murder of the Inca was seriously proposed as a measure of good policy. The crime was committed by order of Pizarro, and with the concurrence of Almagro and the friar Valverde. It was expected that the sovereign's death would be followed by the dispersion of his army, and the submission of the people. This judicial murder was committed in the square of Caxamarca on the 29th of August, 1533. Hernando de Soto was absent at the time, and on his return he expressed the warmest indignation. Several other honorable cavaliers protested against the execution. Their names are even more worthy of being remembered than those of the heroic sixteen who crossed the line on the sea-shore at Gallo."—C. R. Markham, *Pizarro and the Conquest and Settlement of Peru and Chili (Narrative and Critical Hist. of Am., v. 2, ch. 8)*.

ALSO IN: W. H. Prescott, *Hist. of the Conquest of Peru, bk. 8, ch. 1-8 (v. 1)*.—J. Fiske, *The Discovery of America, ch. 10 (v. 2)*.

A. D. 1533-1548.—The fighting of the Spanish conquerors over the spoils.—"The feud between the Pizarros and the Almagros, which forms the next great series of events in American history, is one of the most memorable quarrels in the world. . . . This dire contest in America destroyed almost every person of any note who came within its influence, desolated the country where it originated, prevented the growth of colonization, and changed for the worse the whole course of legislation for the Spanish colonies. Its effects were distinctly visible for a century afterward. . . . There were no signs, however, of the depth and fatality of this feud between the Pizarros and Almagros at the period immediately succeeding the execution of Atahualpa. That act of injustice having been perpetrated, Pizarro gave the royal bora [a peculiar head-dress worn by the reigning Incas, described as a tassel of fine crimson wool] to a brother of the late Inca [who died two months later, of shame and rage at his helpless position], and set out from Cassamarca on his way to Cusco. It was now time to extend his conquests and to make himself master of the chief city in Peru." After a slight resistance, the Spaniards entered "the great and holy city of Cusco," the capital of the Incas, on the 15th of November, 1533. According to the Spanish descriptions it was a remarkable city, constructed with great regularity, having paved streets, with a stone conduit of water running through the middle of each, with grand squares and many splendid palaces and temples. "In Cusco and its environs, including the whole valley which could be seen from the top of the tower, it is said that there were 'a hundred thousand' houses. Among these were shops, and store-houses, and places for the reception of tribute. . . . The great Temple of the Sun had, before the Spaniards rifled Cusco,

been a building of singular gorgeousness. The interior was plated with gold; and on each side of the central image of the Sun were ranged the embalmed bodies of the Incas, sitting upon their golden thrones raised upon pedestals of gold. All round the outside of the building, at the top of the walls, ran a coronal of gold about three feet in depth." For three years the Spaniards held undisturbed possession of Cusco, reducing it to the forms of a Spanish municipality, converting the great Temple of the Sun into a Dominican monastery and turning many palaces into cathedrals and churches. In the meantime, Fernando Pizarro, one of the four brothers of the conqueror, returned from his mission to Spain, whither he had been sent with full accounts of the conquest and with the king's fifth of its spoils. He brought back the title of Marquis for Francisco, and a governor's commission, the province placed under him to be called New Castle. For Pizarro's associate and partner, Almagro, there was also a governorship, but it was one which remained to be conquered. He was authorized to take possession and govern a province, which should be called New Toledo, beginning at the southern boundary of Pizarro's government and extending southward 200 leagues. This was the beginning of quarrels, which Pizarro's brothers were accused of embittering by their insolence. Almagro claimed Cusco, as lying within the limits of his province. Pizarro was engaged in founding a new capital city near the coast, which he began to build in 1535, calling it Los Reyes, but which afterwards received the name of Lima, he would not, however, give up Cusco. The dispute was adjusted in the end, and Almagro set out for the conquest of his province (Chile), much of which had formed part of the dominions of the Inca, and for the subduing of which he commanded the aid of a large army of Peruvians, under two chiefs of the royal family. A few months after this, in the spring of 1536, the nominally reigning Inca, Manco, escaped from his Spanish masters at Cusco, into the mountains, and organized a furious and formidable rising, which brought the Spaniards, both at Cusco and Los Reyes, into great peril, for many months. Before the revolt had been overcome, Almagro returned, unsuccessful and disappointed, from his expedition into Chile, and freshly determined to assert and enforce his claim to Cusco. It is said that he endeavored, at first, to make common cause with the Inca Manco; but his overtures were rejected. He then attacked the Inca and defeated him; marched rapidly on Cusco, arriving before the city April 18, 1537; surprised the garrison while negotiations were going on and gained full possession of the town. Fernando and Gonzalo, two brothers of the Marquis Pizarro, were placed in prison. The latter sent a force of 500 men, under his lieutenant, Alvarado, against the intruder; but Alvarado was encountered on the way and badly beaten. In November there was a meeting brought about, between Pizarro and Almagro, in the hope of some compromise, but they parted from it in sharper enmity than before. Meantime, the younger Pizarro had escaped from his captivity at Cusco, and Fernando had been released. In the spring of 1538 Fernando led an army against the Almagristas, defeated them (April 6, 1538) in a desperate battle near Cusco and entered the city in triumph. Almagro

was taken prisoner, subjected to a formal trial, condemned and executed. The Pizarros were now completely masters of the country and maintained their domination for a few years, extending the Spanish conquests into Chile under Pedro de Valdivia, and exploring and occupying other regions. But in 1541, old hatreds and fresh discontents came to a head in a plot which bore fruit in the assassination of the governor, the Marquis Pizarro, now past 70 years of age. A young half-caste son of old Almagro was installed in the governorship by the conspirators, and when, the next year, a new royally commissioned governor, Vaca de Castro, arrived from Spain, young Almagro was mad enough to resist him. His rebellion was overcome speedily and he suffered death. Vaca de Castro was superseded in 1544 by a viceroy, Blasco Nuñez Vela, sent out by the emperor, Charles V., to enforce the "New Laws," lately framed in Spain, under the influence of Las Casas, to protect the natives, by a gradual abolition of the "repartimientos" and "encomiendas." A rebellion occurred, in which Gonzalo Pizarro took the lead, and the Spanish government was forced to annul the "New Laws." Pizarro, however, still refused to submit, and was only overcome after a civil war of two years, which ended in his defeat and death. This closed the turbulent career of the Pizarro brothers in Peru; but the country did not settle into peace until after some years — Sir A. Helps, *The Spanish Conquest in Am.*, bk. 17-18 (n. 4).

Also in: W. H. Prescott, *Hist. of the Conquest of Peru*.

A. D. 1539-1541. — Gonzalo Pizarro's expedition to the head waters of the Amazon and Orellana's voyage down the great river. See AMAZON RIVER.

A. D. 1550-1816. — Under the Spanish Viceroy. — "When the President la Gasca had conquered Gonzalo Pizarro and returned to Spain, a peaceful viceroy arrived in Peru, sprung from one of the noblest families of the peninsula. This was Don Antonio de Mendoza. . . . Don Antonio died in 1551, after a very brief enjoyment of his power; but from this date, during the whole period of the rule of kings of the Austrian House, the Peruvian Viceroyalty was always filled by members of the greatest families of Spain. . . . At an immense distance from the mother country, and ruling at one time nearly the whole of South America, including the present republics of Venezuela, New Granada, Ecuador, Peru, Chile, Bolivia, and La Plata, the court of the Viceroy was surrounded by regal pomp and magnificence. . . . The archbishop of Lima ranked next to the viceroy, and filled his post during his absence from the capital. . . . It was not long after the conquest before the inquisition, that fearful engine of the despotic power of Spain, was established in Peru. . . . The Indians were exempted from its jurisdiction in theory, but whether, in practice, this unfortunate and persecuted people always escaped may be considered as doubtful. It was only in the beginning of the present century, and shortly before the commencement of the war of independence, that this fearful tribunal was abolished." Under the senseless government of Philip II. the seeds of decay and ruin were planted in every part of the Spanish empire. "Though receiving from the silver mines of

Peru and Mexico the largest revenue of any sovereign in Europe, his coffers were always empty, and of \$35,000,000 received from America in 1595, not one rial remained in Spain in 1596. . . . Then followed the reigns of his worthless descendants and their profligate ministers; and fast and heedlessly did they drive this unfortunate country on the high road to ruin and poverty. On the establishment of the Bourbon kings of Spain in 1714, a more enlightened policy began to show itself in the various measures of government; and the trade to the colonies, which had hitherto been confined by the strictest monopoly, was slightly opened. At this time, the commerce of Peru and Mexico was carried on by what was called the 'flota,' consisting of three men-of-war and about fifteen merchant-vessels, of from 400 to 1,000 tons. Every kind of manufactured article of merchandise was embarked on board this fleet, so that all the trading ports of Europe were interested in its cargo, and Spain itself sent out little more than wines and brandy. The flota sailed from Cadiz, and was not allowed to break bulk on any account during the voyage. Arriving at Vera Cruz, it took in, for the return voyage, cargoes of silver, cocoa, indigo, cochineal, tobacco, and sugar; and sailed to the rendezvous at Havannah, where it awaited the galleons from Porto Bello, with all the riches of Peru. The galleons were vessels of about 500 tons; and an immense fair, which collected merchants from all parts of South America, was commenced at Porto Bello on their arrival." About the middle of the 18th century, "a marked change appears to have come over the colonial policy of Spain; and the enlightened government of the good Count Florida Blanca, who was prime minister for 20 years, introduced a few attempts at administrative reform, not before they were needed, into the colonial government. The enormous viceroyalty of Peru, long found to be too large for a single command, was divided; and viceroys were appointed in La Plata and New Granada, while another royal audience was established at Quito. The haughty grandees of Spain also ceased to come out to Peru; and in their places practical men, who had done good service as captains-general of Chile, were appointed viceroys, such as Don Manuel Amat, in 1761, and Don Agustin Jaurequi, in 1780. At last, Don Ambrosio O'Higgins, whose father was a poor Irish adventurer, who kept a little retail shop in the square at Lima, became viceroy of Peru, and was created Marquis of Osorno. . . . His son, the famous General O'Higgins, was one of the liberators of Chile. O'Higgins was followed in the viceroyalty by the Marquis of Aviles, and in 1806, Don Jose Abascal, an excellent ruler, assumed the reins of government. . . . But the rule of Spain was drawing to a close. The successor of Abascal, General Pezuela, was the last viceroy who peacefully succeeded. . . . Many things had tended to prepare the minds of the Creole population for revolt. The partial opening of foreign trade by Florida Blanca; the knowledge of their own enslaved condition, obtained through the medium of their increasing intercourse with independent states; and, finally, the invasion of the mother country by Napoleon's armies, brought popular excitement in South America to such a height that it required but a spark to ignite the inflammable materials." — C. R. Mark-

ham, *Cuzco, and Lima*, ch. 9.—The natives of Spanish descent had received heroic examples of revolt from the Inca Peruvians. “In November, 1780, a chief named Tupac Amaru rose in rebellion. His original object was to obtain guarantees for the due observance of the laws and their just administration. But when his moderate demands were only answered by cruel taunts and brutal menaces, he saw that independence or death were the only alternatives. He was a descendant of the ancient sovereigns, and he was proclaimed Ynca of Peru. A vast army joined him, as if by magic, and the Spanish dominion was shaken to its foundations. The insurrection all but succeeded, and a doubtful war was maintained for two years and a half. It lasted until July, 1783, and the cruelties which followed its suppression were due to the cowardly terror of panic stricken tyrants. Tupac Amaru did not suffer in vain. From the cruel death of the Ynca date the feelings which resulted in the independence of Peru. In 1814, another native chief, named Pumacagua, raised the cry of independence at Cuzco, and the sons of those who fell with Tupac Amaru flocked in thousands to his standard. The patriot army entered Arequipa in triumph, and was joined by many Spanish Americans, including the enthusiastic young poet, *Melgar*. Untrained valor succumbed to discipline, and in March, 1815, the insurrection was stamped out, but with less cruelty than disgraced the Spanish name in 1783.”—The same, *Peru*, p. 150.

A. D. 1579.—The piracies of Drake. See AMERICA. A. D. 1572-1580.

A. D. 1776.—Separation of the viceroyalty of Buenos Ayres. See ARGENTINE REPUBLIC. A. D. 1580-1777.

A. D. 1820-1826.—The Struggle for Independence.—Help from Chile and Colombia.—San Martin and Bolivar, the Liberators.—The decisive battle of Ayacucho.—“The great struggle for independence in the Spanish provinces of South America had been elsewhere, for the most part, crowned with success before Peru became the theatre for important action. Here the Spaniards maintained possession of their last stronghold upon the continent, and, but for assistance from the neighbouring independent provinces, there would hardly have appeared a prospect of overthrowing the viceroyal government. . . . In the month of August, 1820, independence having been established in Chili [see CHILE: A. D. 1810-1818], an army of between 4,000 and 5,000 men was assembled at Valparaiso for the purpose of breaking up the royalist strongholds of Peru, and of freeing that province from the dominion of Spain. The command was held by General Jose de San Martin, the emancipator of Chili, to whose exertions the expedition was mainly attributable. Such vessels of war as could be procured were fitted out and placed under command of Lord Cochrane. In the month following, the whole force was landed and quartered at Pisco, on the Peruvian coast, without opposition from the royalist forces, which retreated to Lima, about 100 miles northward. An attempt at negotiation having failed, the army of invasion was again in motion in the month of October. The naval force anchored off Callao, where, on the night of November 5th, Lord Cochrane [afterwards Lord Dundonald], commanding in person, succeeded in cutting out

and capturing the Spanish frigate *Esmerelda*, which lay under the protection of the guns of the fort, and in company with a number of smaller armed vessels. This exploit is considered as one of the most brilliant achievements of the kind on record. The main body of the Chilean troops was transported to Huara, about 75 miles north of the capital. . . . As San Martin, after some months’ delay at Huara, advanced upon Lima, the city was thrown into the utmost confusion. The Spanish authorities found it necessary to evacuate the place. . . . The general [San Martin] entered the city on the 12th of July, 1821, unaccompanied by his army, and experienced little difficulty in satisfying the terrified inhabitants as to his good faith and the honesty of his intentions. All went on prosperously for the cause, and on the 28th the independence of Peru was formally proclaimed, amid the greatest exhibition of enthusiasm on the part of the populace. On the 3d of the ensuing month San Martin assumed the title of Protector of Peru. No important military movements took place during a considerable subsequent period. The fortress at Callao remained in possession of the royalists until the 21st of September, when it capitulated. “The independent army remained at Lima, for the most part unemployed, during a number of months subsequent to these events, and their presence began to be felt as a burden by the inhabitants. In April, 1822, a severe reverse was felt in the surprise and capture, by Canterac [the viceroy], of a very considerable body of the revolutionary forces, at Ica. An interview took place in the month of July, of this year [1821], between the Protector and the great champion of freedom in South America, Bolivar, then in the full pride of success in the northern provinces. The result of the meeting was the augmentation of the force at Lima by 2,000 Columbian troops. During San Martin’s absence the tyranny of his minister, Monteagudo, who made the deputy protector, the Marquis of Truxillo, a mere tool for the execution of his private projects, excited an outbreak, which was only quelled by the arrest and removal of the offending party. In the succeeding month the first independent congress was assembled at the capital, and San Martin, having resigned his authority, soon after took his departure for Chili. Congress appointed a junta of three persons to discharge the duties of the executive. Under this administration the affairs of the new republic fell into great disorder.” In June, 1823, the Spanish viceroy regained possession of Lima, but withdrew his troops from it again a month later. Nevertheless, “all hopes of success in the enterprise of the revolution now seemed to rest upon the arrival of foreign assistance, and this was fortunately at hand. Simon Bolivar, the liberator of Venezuela, and the most distinguished of the champions of freedom in South America, had so far reduced the affairs of the recently constituted northern states [see COLOMBIAN STATES: A. D. 1810-1819; and 1819-1890] to order and security, that he was enabled to turn his attention to the distressed condition of the Peruvian patriots. He proceeded at once to the scene of action, and entered Lima on the 1st of September, 1823. . . . He was received with great rejoicing, and was at once invested with supreme power, both civil and military. . . . In February, 1824, an insurrection of the garrison at Callao resulted

in the recapture of this important stronghold by the Spaniards, and a few weeks later the capital shared the same fate. The revolutionary congress broke up, after declaring its own dissolution and the confirmation of Bolívar's authority as supreme dictator. This gloomy state of affairs only served to call forth the full energies of the great general. He had under his command about 10,000 troops, the majority of whom were Columbians, stationed near Patavilca. The available forces of the royalists were at this period numerically far superior to those of the patriots." An action which did not become general took place on the plains of Junin, but no decisive engagement occurred until the 9th of December, 1824, "when the decisive battle of Ayacucho, one of the most remarkable in its details and important in its results ever fought in South America, gave a deathblow to Spanish power in Peru. The attack was commenced by the royalists, under command of the viceroy. Their numbers very considerably exceeded those of the patriots, being set down at over 9,000, while those of the latter fell short of 6,000. . . . After a single hour's hard fighting, the assailants were routed and driven back to the heights of Condorcanqui, where, previous to the battle, they had taken a position. Their loss was 1,400 in killed and 700 wounded. The patriots lost in killed and wounded a little less than 1,000." Before the day closed, Canterac, the viceroy, entered the patriot camp and arranged the terms of a capitulation with General Sucre—who had commanded in the battle and won its honors, Bolívar not being present. "His whole remaining army became prisoners of war, and by the terms of the capitulation all the Spanish forces in Peru were also bound to surrender." A strong body of Spanish troops held out, however, in Upper Peru (afterwards Bolivia) until April, 1825, and the royalists who had taken refuge at Callao endured with desperate obstinacy a siege which was protracted until January, 1826, when most of them had perished of hunger and disease. "Bolívar was still clothed with the powers of a dictator in Peru. . . . He was anxious to bring about the adoption by the Peruvians of the civil code known as the Bolivian constitution, but it proved generally unsatisfactory. While he remained in the country, it is said, 'the people overwhelmed him with professions of gratitude, and addressed him in language unsuitable to any being below the Deity.' A reaction took place notwithstanding, and numbers were found ready to accuse this truly great man of selfish personal ambition."—H. Brownell, *North and South America: Peru*, ch. 12-13.

Also in: Earl of Dundonald, *Autobiog. of a Seaman, Sequel*, ch. 8.—J. Miller, *Memoirs of General Miller*, ch. 12-27 (v. 1-2).—T. Sutcliffe, *Sixteen Years in Chile and Peru*, ch. 2-3.

A. D. 1825-1826.—The founding of the Republic of Bolivia in upper Peru.—The Bolivian Constitution.—"Bolívar reassembled the deputies of the Congress of Lower Peru, February 10, 1825, and in his message to that body resigned the dictatorship, adding, 'I felicitate Péru on her being delivered from whatever is most dreadful on earth; from war by the victory of Ayacucho, and from despotism by my resignation. Proscribe for ever, I entreat you, this tremendous authority, which was the sepulchre of Rome.' On the same occasion he also said;

'My continuance in this republic is an absurd and monstrous phenomenon; it is the approbrium of Peru; with other expressions equally strong, while at the same time, at the pressing solicitation of the Congress, he consented, notwithstanding his many declarations of reluctance, to remain at the head of the republic. Nothing could exceed the blind submissiveness of this Congress to Bolívar. After investing him with dictatorial authority for another year, they voted him a grant of a million of dollars, which he twice refused, with a disinterestedness that does him the greatest honor. . . . Liberality of feeling, and entire freedom from rapacity of spirit, must be admitted as prominent traits in his character. After continuing in session about a month, the Congress came to a resolution, that as they had granted absolute and unconditional power to Bolívar, in regard to all subjects, whether legislative or executive, it was unnecessary, and incompatible with his authority, that they should continue to exercise their functions; and they accordingly separated. Bolívar, being left without check or control in the government, after issuing a decree for installing a new Congress at Lima the ensuing year, departed from Lima in April, for the purpose of visiting the interior provinces of Upper and Lower Peru. . . . There is reason to believe, that the flattering reception, with which he was greeted on this tour, largely contributed to foster those views of ambition respecting Peru, which he betrayed in the sequel. Certain it is, at least, that the extravagant gratitude of the inhabitants of Peru, gave him occasion to assume the task of a legislator, and thus to bring his political principles more directly before the world. When the victory of Ayacucho left the provinces of Upper Peru free to act, the great question presented to their consideration was, whether Upper Peru should be united to Lower Peru, or reannexed to Buenos Ayres, or constitute an independent state. Under the auspices of the Liberator and of Sucre [Bolívar's chief of staff], a general assembly was convened at Chuquisaco in August, 1825, which declared the will of the people to be, that Upper Peru should become a separate republic, and decreed that it should be called Bolivia in honor of the Liberator. Here their functions should properly have ceased, with the fulfilment of the object for which they met. Regardless, however, of the limited extent of their powers, they proceeded to exercise the authority of a general Congress. They conferred the supreme executive powers on Bolívar, so long as he should reside within the territory of the republic. Sucre was made captain-general of the army, with the title of Grand Marshal of Ayacucho, and his name was bestowed upon the capital. Medals, statues, and pictures were bountifully and profusely decreed, in honor of both Sucre and Bolívar. To the latter was voted a million of dollars, as an acknowledgment of his preeminent services to the country. With the same characteristic magnanimity, which he displayed on a like occasion in Lower Peru, he refused to accept the grant for his own benefit, but desired that it might be appropriated to purchasing the emancipation of about a thousand negroes held in servitude in Bolivia. Finally, they solicited Bolívar to prepare for the new republic a fundamental code, that should perpetuate his political principles in the very frame and constitution of the state.

Captivated by the idea of creating a nation, from its very foundation, Bolívar consented to undertake the task, if, indeed, which has been confidently asserted to be the case, he did not himself procure the request to be made. The Liberator left Chuquisaca in January, 1826, and returned to Lima, to assist at the installation of the Congress summoned to meet there in February. He transmitted the form of a constitution for Bolivia from Lima, accompanied with an address, bearing date May 25, 1826. Of this extraordinary instrument, we feel at a loss to decide in what terms to speak. Bolívar has again and again declared, that it contains his confession of political faith. He gave all the powers of his mind to its preparation, he proclaimed it as the well-weighed result of his anxious meditations . . . This constitution proposes a consolidated or central, not a federal, form of government, and thus far it is unobjectionable. Every ten citizens are to name an elector, whose tenure of office is four years. The Legislative power is to be vested in three branches, called tribunes, senators, and censors. Tribunes are to be elected for four years, senators for eight, and censors for life. So complicated is the arrangement proposed for the enactment of laws by means of this novel legislature, and so arbitrary and unnatural the distribution of powers among the several branches, that it would be impracticable for any people, having just notions of legislative proceedings, to conduct public business in the projected mode, and much more impracticable for men, like the South Americans, not at all familiar with the business of orderly legislation. But the most odious feature in the constitution relates to the nature and appointment of the executive authority. It is placed in the hands of a president, elected in the first instance by the legislative body, holding his office for life, without responsibility for the acts of his administration, and having the appointment of his successor. The whole patronage of the state, every appointment of any importance, from the vice president and secretaries of state down to the officers of the revenue, belongs to him; in him is placed the absolute control of all the military force of the nation, it being at the same time specially provided, that a permanent armed force shall be constantly maintained. For the mighty power, the irresistible influence, which this plan imparts to the executive, the only corresponding security, assured to the people, is the inviolability of persons and property. The constituent Congress of Bolivia assembled at Chuquisaca, May 25, 1826, and passively adopted the proposed constitution to the letter, as if it had been a charter granted by a sovereign prince to his subjects, instead of a plan of government submitted to a deliberative assembly for their consideration. It took effect accordingly, as the constitution of Bolivia, and was sworn to by the people; and General Sucre was elected president for life under it, although one of its provisions expressly required, that the president should be a native of Bolivia."—C. Cushing, *Bolívar and the Bolivian Constitution* (N. A. Rev., Jan. 1830).

A. D. 1826-1876.—Retirement of Bolívar.—Attempted confederation with Bolivia and war with Chile.—The succession of military presidents.—Abolition of Slavery.—War with Spain.—"As Bolívar . . . was again prevailed upon [1826] by the Peruvians to accept the

dictatorship of the northern republic, and was at the same time President of the United States of Colombia, he was by far the most powerful man on the continent of America. For a time it was supposed that the balance of power on the southern continent was falling into Colombian hands . . . But the power of Bolívar, even in his own country, rested on a tottering basis. Much more was this the case in the greater Vice-royalty. The Peruvian generals, who ruled the opinion of the country, were incurably jealous of him and his army, and got rid of the latter as soon as they could clear off the arrears of pay. They looked upon the Code Bolívar itself as a badge of servitude, and were not sorry when the domestic disturbances of Colombia summoned the Dictator from among them [September, 1826]. The Peruvians, who owed a heavy debt, both in money and gratitude, to Colombia, now altogether repudiated Bolívar, his code, and his government, and the Bolivians followed their example by expelling Sucre and his Colombian troops (1828). The revolution which expelled the Colombian element was mainly a national and military one but it was no doubt assisted by whatever of liberalism existed in the country. Bolívar had now shown himself in Colombia to be the apostle of military tyranny, and he was not likely to assume another character in Peru. The ascendancy of Colombia in the Perus was thus of short duration, but the people of the two Perus only exchanged Colombian dictatorship for that of the generals of their own nation."—E. J. Payne, *Hist. of European Colonies*, pp. 290-291.—"A Peruvian Congress met in 1827, after General Bolívar had returned to Colombia, and elected Don José Lamar, the leader of the Peruvian infantry at Ayacucho, as President of the Republic, but his defeat in an attempt to wrest Guayaquil from Colombia led to his fall, and Agustín Gamarra, an Ynca Indian of Cuzco, succeeded him in 1829. Although successful soldiers secured the presidential chair, the administration in the early days of the Republic contained men of rank, and others of integrity and talent. . . . General Gamarra served his regular term of office, and after a discreditable display of sedition he was succeeded in 1834 by Don Luis José Orbegoso. Then followed an attempt to unite Peru and Bolivia in a confederation. The plan was conceived by Don Andres Santa Cruz, an Ynca Indian of high descent, who had been President of Bolivia since 1828. Orbegoso concurred, and the scheme, which had in it some elements of hopefulness and success, was carried out, but not without deplorable bloodshed. The Peru-Bolivian Confederation was divided into three States—North Peru, South Peru, and Bolivia. During the ascendancy of Santa Cruz, Peru enjoyed a period of peace and prosperity. But his power excited the jealousy of Chile, and that Republic united with Peruvian malcontents, headed by General Gamarra, to destroy it. A Chilean army landed, and Santa Cruz was hopelessly defeated in the battle of Yungay, which was fought in the Callejon de Huaylas, on the banks of the river Santa, on January 20th, 1839. A Congress assembled at the little town of Huancayo, in the Sierra, which acknowledged Gamarra as President of the Republic, and proclaimed a new Constitution on November 16th, 1839. But the new state of things was of short duration. On the

pretext of danger from the party of Santa Cruz, war was declared upon Bolivia, which resulted in the defeat of the Peruvians at the battle of Yngavi, near the banks of Lake Titicaca, on November 20th, 1841, and the death of Gamarra. A very discreditable period of anarchy ensued, during which Gamarra's generals fought with each other for supremacy, which was ended by the success of another Indian, and on April 19th, 1845, General Don Ramon Castilla was proclaimed Constitutional President of Peru. Uneducated and ignorant, his administrative merits were small, but his firm and vigorous grasp of power secured for Peru long periods of peace. . . . At the end of Castilla's term of office General Echenique succeeded him, but in 1854 Castilla placed himself at the head of a revolution, and again found himself in power. A new Constitution was promulgated in 1856, the tribute of the Indians and negro slavery were abolished, and a grant of \$1,710,000 was voted as compensation to the owners of slaves. The mass of the people ceased to be taxed. The revenue was entirely derived from sales of guano, customs duties, licences, and stamps. . . . When Castilla retired from office in 1862, he was succeeded by General San Roman, an old Ynca Indian of Puno, whose father had fought under Pumacagua. The Republic had then existed for 40 years, during which time it had been torn by civil or external wars for nine years and had enjoyed 31 years of peace and order. Very great advances had been made in prosperity during the years of peace. . . . General San Roman died in 1863, his Vice President, General Pezet, was replaced [through a revolution] by Colonel Don Mariano Ignacio Prado, and a war with Spain practically ended with the repulse of the Spanish fleet from Callao on May 2nd, 1866. The war was unjust, the pretext being the alleged ill-treatment of some Spanish immigrants at an estate called Talambo, in the coast valley of Jequetepeque, which might easily have been arranged by arbitration. But the success at Callao aroused the enthusiasm of the people and excited strong patriotic feelings. Colonel Don José Balta was elected President of Peru on August 2nd, 1868, the present Constitution having been proclaimed on August 31st, 1867. The Senate is composed of Deputies of the Provinces, with a property qualification, and the House of Representatives of members nominated by electoral colleges of provinces and districts, one member for every 20,000 inhabitants. The district colleges choose deputies to the provincial colleges, who elect the representatives to Congress. There are 44 senators and 110 representatives. Executive power is in the hands of a President and Vice-President, elected for four years, with a Cabinet of five Ministers. . . . The government of Colonel Balta entered upon a career of wild extravagance, and pushed forward the execution of railways and other public works with feverish haste, bringing ruin upon the country. . . . It is sad that a wretched military outbreak, in which the President was killed on July 26th, 1872, should have given it a tragic termination. . . . On August 2nd, 1872, Don Manuel Pardo became Constitutional President of Peru. He was the first civilian that had been elected. . . . He came to the helm at a period of great financial difficulty, and he undertook a thankless but patriotic task. . . . He was the best President

that Peru has ever known. When his term of office came to an end, he was peacefully succeeded, on August 2nd, 1876, by General Don Mariano Ignacio Prado."—C. R. Markham, *Peru*, ch. 8.

A. D. 1879-1884.—The disastrous war with Chile. See CHILE: A. D. 1833-1884.

A. D. 1886-1894.—Slow recovery.—Since the close of the war with Chile, Peru has been slowly recovering from its destructive effects. General Caceres became President in 1886, and was succeeded in 1890 by General Remigio Morales Bermudez, whose term expires in 1894.

PERUGIA, Early history of. See PERUSIA. Under the domination of the Baglioni. See BAGLIONI.

PERUS, The Two.—Upper Peru and Lower Peru of the older Spanish viceroyalty are represented, at the present time, the former by the Republic of Bolivia, the latter by the Republic of Peru.

PERUSIA, The war of.—In the second year of the triumvirate of Octavius, Antony and Lepidus, Antony being in the east, his wife Fulvia and his brother fomented a revolt in Italy against Octavius, which forced the latter for a time to quit Rome. But his coolness, with the energy and ability of his friend Agrippa, overcame the conspiracy. The army of the insurgents was blockaded in Perusia (modern Perugia) and sustained a siege of several months, so obstinate that the whole affair came to be called the war of Perusia. The siege was distinguished by a peculiar horror, for the slaves of the city were deliberately starved to death, being denied food and also denied escape, lest the besiegers should learn of the scarcity within the walls.—C. Merivale, *Hist. of Rome*, ch. 27.

PERUVIAN BARK, Introduction of. See MEDICAL SCIENCE, 17TH CENTURY.

PERUVIAN QUIPU. See QUIPU.

PES, The. See FOOT, THE ROMAN.

PESHWA OF THE MAHRATTAS, The. See INDIA: A. D. 1662-1748; 1798-1805; and 1816-1819.

PESO DE ORO. See SPANISH COINS.

PESTALOZZI, and educational reform. See EDUCATION, MODERN: REFORMS, &c. : A. D. 1798-1827.

PESTH: A. D. 1241.—Destruction by the Mongols. See MONGOLS. A. D. 1239-1294.

A. D. 1872.—Union with Buda. See BUDA-PESTH.

PESTILENCE. See PLAGUE.

PETALISM.—A vote of banishment which the ancient Syracusans brought into practice for a time, in imitation of the Ostracism of the Athenians,—(see OSTRACISM). The name of the citizen to be banished was written, at Syracuse, on olive leaves, instead of on shells, as at Athens. Hence the name, petalism.—Diodorus, *Historical Library*, bk. 11, ch. 26.

PETER, Latin Emperor at Constantinople (Romania). A. D. 1217-1219. . . . Peter I. (called The Great), Czar of Russia, 1689-1725. . . . Peter I., King of Aragon and Navarre, 1094-1104. . . . Peter I., King of Hungary, 1088-1046. . . . Peter II., Czar of Russia, 1727-1760. . . . Peter II., King of Aragon, 1196-1218. . . . Peter

PETER.

II., King of Sicily, 1337-1342 . . . Peter III., Czar of Russia, 1762 . . . Peter III., King of Aragon, 1276-1285, King of Sicily, 1283-1285. . . . Peter IV., King of Aragon, 1336-1337 . . . Peter the Hermit's Crusade. See CRUSADES: A. D. 1094-1095, and 1096-1099.

PETER, Saint. See PAPACY.

PETERBOROUGH, Earl of, and the siege of Barcelona. See SPAIN A D 1705

PETERLOO, Massacre of. See ENGLAND: A. D. 1816-1820

PETER'S PENCE.—King Offa, of the old English kingdom of Mercia, procured, by a liberal tribute to Rome, a new archbishopric for Lichfield, thus dividing the province of Canterbury. "This payment . . . is probably the origin of the Rom-foeh, or Peter's pence, a tax of a penny on every hearth, which was collected [in England] and sent to Rome from the beginning of the tenth century, and was a subject of frequent legislation. But the archiepiscopate of Lichfield scarcely survived its founder"—W. Stubbs, *Const Hist of Eng*, ch 8, sect 86 (n 1)

PETERSBURG, Siege and evacuation of. See UNITED STATES OF AM. A. D. 1864 (JUNE VIRGINIA). (JULY VIRGINIA), (AUGUST. VIRGINIA), 1865 (MARCH-APRIL. VIRGINIA)

PETERSHAM, Rout of Shays' rebels at. See MASSACHUSETTS A D 1786-1787

PETERVARDEIN, Battle of (1716). See HUNGARY A D 1699-1718

PETILIA, Battle at. See SPARTACUS, RISING OF

PETIT SERJEANTY. See FEUDAL TERRITORIES

PETITION OF RIGHT, The. See ENGLAND A D 1625-1628, and 1628

PETITS MAITRES, Les. See FRANCE A. D. 1630-1651

PETRA, Arabia.—The rock-city of the Nabateans. See NABATHEANS

PETRA, Illyricum: Caesar's blockade of Pompeius. See ROME B C 48

PETRA, Lazica. See LAZICA

PETROBRUSIANS.—HENRICIANS.—"The heretic who, for above twenty years, attempted a restoration of a simple religion in Southern France, the well known Pierre de Bruys, a native of Gap or Embrun, . . . warred against images and all other visible emblems of worship; he questioned the expediency of infant baptism, the soundness of the doctrine of transubstantiation, and opposed prayers for the dead, but he professed poverty for himself, and would have equally enforced it upon all the ministers of the altar. He protested against the payment of tithes, and it was, most probably, owing to this last, the most heinous of all offences, that he was, towards 1130, burnt with slow fire by a populace maddened by the priests, at St. Gilles, on the Rhone. . . . His followers rallied . . . and changed their name of Petrobrusians into that of Henricians, when the mantle of their first master rested on the shoulders of Henry, supposed by Mosheim [Eccles. Hist., v. 2] to have been an Italian Eremit monk"—L. Mariotti (A. Gallenga), *Frd Dolcino and his Times*, ch. 1.

PETROCORII, The.—A Gallic tribe established in the ancient Périgord, the modern French department of the Dordogne.—Napoleon III., *Hist. of Caesar*, bk. 8, ch. 2, foot-note.

PETRONILLA, Queen of Aragon, A. D. 1137-1163.

PHALANX.

PETRONIUS MAXIMUS, Roman Emperor (Western), A. D. 455.

PEUCINI, The.—"The Peucini derived their name from the little island Peuce (Piczino) at the mouth of the Danube. Pliny (iv. 14) speaks of them as a German people bordering on the Daci. They would thus stretch through Moldavia from the Carpathian Mountains to the Black Sea. Under the name Bastarne they are mentioned by Livy (xl. 57, 58) as a powerful people, who helped Philip, king of Macedonia, in his wars with the Romans. Plutarch ('Life of Paullus Æmilius,' ch ix) says they were the same as the Galatæ, who dwelt round the Ister (Danube). If so, they were Gauls, which Livy also implies"—Church and Brodrribb, *Geog. Notes to The Germany of Tacitus*

PEUKETIANS, The. See ENOTRIANS

PEUTINGERIAN TABLE, The.—This is the name given to the only copy which has survived of a Roman official road chart. "Tables of this kind were not maps in the proper sense of the term, but were rather diagrams drawn purposely out of proportion, on which the public roads were projected in a panoramic view. The latitude and longitude and the positions of rivers and mountains were disregarded so far as they might interfere with the display of the provinces, the outlines being flattened out to suit the shape of a roll of parchment, but the distances between the stations were inserted in numerals so that an extract from the record might be used as a supplement to the table of mileage in the road book. The copy now remaining derives its name from Conrad Peutinger of Augsburg, in whose library it was found on his death in 1547. It is supposed to have been brought to Europe from a monastery in the Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem, and to have been a copy taken by some thirteenth century scribe from an original assigned to the beginning of the fourth century or the end of the third"—C. Elton, *Origins of English Hist*, ch 11 and plate 1

ALSO IN: W. M. Ramsay, *Hist. Geog. of Asia Minor*, pt 1, ch 8

PEVENSEY.—The landing place of William the Conqueror, September 28, A D 1066, when he came to win the crown of England. See, also, ANDERIDA

PFALZ.—PFALZGRAF.—In German, the term signifying Palatine and PALATINE COUNT, which see

PHACUSEH. See JEWS. THE ROUTE OF THE EXODUS.

PHÆACIANS, The.—"We are wholly at a loss to explain the reasons that led the Greeks in early times . . . to treat the Phœacians [of Homer's *Odyssey*] as a historical people, and to identify the Homeric Scheria with the island of Corcyra [modern Corfu]. . . . We must . . . be content to banish the kindly and hospitable Phœacians, as well as the barbarous Cyclopes and Læstrygones, to that outer zone of the Homeric world, in which everything was still shrouded in a veil of marvel and mystery."—E. H. Bunbury, *Hist. of Ancient Geog.*, ch. 8, sect. 8 (n 1).

PHALANGITES, The.—The soldiers of the Macedonian phalanx.

PHALANX, The Macedonian.—"The main body, the phalanx—or quadruple phalanx, as it was sometimes called, to mark that it was formed of four divisions, each bearing

the same name—presented a mass of 18,000 men, which was distributed, at least by Alexander, into six brigades of 3,000 each, formidable in its aspect, and, on ground suited to its operations, irresistible in its attacks. The phalangite soldier wore the usual defensive armour of the Greek heavy infantry, helmet, breast-plate, and greaves; and almost the whole front of his person was covered with the long shield called the aspis. His weapons were a sword, long enough to enable a man in the second rank to reach an enemy who had come to close quarters with the comrade who stood before him, and the celebrated spear, known by the Macedonian name sarissa, four and twenty feet long. The sarissa, when couched, projected eighteen feet in front of the soldier, and the space between the ranks was such that those of the second rank were fifteen, those of the third twelve, those of the fourth nine, those of the fifth six, and those of the sixth three feet in advance of the first line; so that the man at the head of the file was guarded on each side by the points of six spears. The ordinary depth of the phalanx was of sixteen ranks. The men who stood too far behind to use their sarissas, and who therefore kept them raised until they advanced to fill a vacant place, still added to the pressure of the mass. As the efficacy of the phalanx depended on its compactness, and this again on the uniformity of its movements, the greatest care was taken to select the best soldiers for the foremost and hindmost ranks—the frames, as it were, of the engine. The bulk and core of the phalanx consisted of Macedonians; but it was composed in part of foreign troops."—C. Thirlwall, *Hist. of Greece*, ch. 48

PHALARIS, *Brazen bull of*.—*Epistles of*.—Phalaris is said to have been a rich man who made himself tyrant of the Greek city of Agrigentum in Sicily, about 570 B. C., and who distinguished himself above all others of his kind by his cruelties. He seems to have been especially infamous in early times on account of his brazen bull. "This piece of mechanism was hollow, and sufficiently capacious to contain one or more victims enclosed within it, to perish in tortures when the metal was heated: the cries of these suffering prisoners passed for the roarings of the animal. The artist was named Perillus, and is said to have been himself the first person burnt in it by order of the despot."—G. Grote, *Hist. of Greece*, pt. 2, ch. 43.—At a later time Phalaris was represented as having been a man of culture and letters, and certain Epistles were ascribed to him which most scholars now regard as forgeries. The famous treatise of Bentley is thought to have settled the question

PHALERUM. See *PIRAEUS*.

PHANARIOTS, *The*.—"The reduction of Constantinople, in 1453, was mainly achieved by the extraordinary exploit of Mahomet II. in transporting his galleys from the Bosphorus to the interior of the harbour, by dragging them over land from Dolma Bactche, and again launching them opposite to the quarter denominated the Phanar, from a lantern suspended over the gate which there communicates with the city. The inhabitants of this district, either from terror or treachery, are said to have subsequently thrown open a passage to the conqueror; and Mahomet, as a remuneration, assigned them for their residence this portion of Constantinople,

which has since continued to be occupied by the Patriarch and the most distinguished families of the Greeks. It is only, however, within the last century and a half that the Phanariots have attained any distinction beyond that of merchants and bankers, or that their name, from merely designating their residence, has been used to indicate their diplomatic employments."—Sir J. E. Tennent, *Hist. of Modern Greece*, ch. 12 (v. 2).

ALSO IN: E. A. Freeman, *The Ottoman Power in Europe*, ch. 4.—J. Samuelson, *Roumania, Past and Present*, ch. 18, sect. 3-7.

PHARAOH, *The title*.—The title Pharaoh which was given to the kings of ancient Egypt, "appears on the monuments as pirus, 'great house,' the palace in which the king lived being used to denote the king himself, just as in our own time the 'porte' or gate of the palace has become synonymous with the Turkish Sultan."—A. H. Sayce *Fresh Light from the Ancient Monuments*, ch. 2.

PHARAOHITES. See *GYPSIES*.

PHARISEES, *The*. See *CHASIDIM*; and *SADDUCEES*.

PHARSALIA; *Battle of*. See *ROME*: B. C. 48.

PHELPS' AND GORHAM'S PURCHASE. See *NEW YORK*: A. D. 1786-1799.

PERÆ.—A town in ancient Thessaly which acquired an evil fame in Greek history, during the fourth century, B. C., by the power and the cruelty of the tyrants who ruled it and who extended their sway for a time over the greater part of Thessaly. Jason and Alexander were the most notorious of the brood.

PHILADELPHIA, *Asia Minor*.—The city of Philadelphia, founded by Attalus Philadelphus of Pergamum, in eastern Lydia, not far from Sardes, was one in which Christianity flourished at an early day, and which prospered for several centuries, notwithstanding repeated calamities of earthquake. It was the last community of Greeks in Asia Minor which retained its independence of the Turks. It stood out for two generations in the midst of the Seljuk Turks, after all around it had succumbed. The brave city was finally taken by the Ottoman sultan, Bayezid, or Bajazet, about 1390. The Turks then gave it the name Alashehr.—G. Finlay, *Hist. of the Byzantine and Greek Empires*, bk. 4, ch. 2, sect. 4 (r. 2).

PHILADELPHIA, *Penn.*: A. D. 1641.—The first settlement, by New Haven colonists. See *NEW JERSEY*: A. D. 1640-1655.

A. D. 1682-1685.—Penn's founding of the city. See *PENNSYLVANIA*: A. D. 1682-1685.

A. D. 1686-1692.—Bradford's Press. See *PRINTING AND THE PRESS*: A. D. 1535-1709.

A. D. 1701.—Chartered as a city. See *PENNSYLVANIA*: A. D. 1701-1718.

A. D. 1719-1729.—The first newspapers.—Franklin's advent. See *PRINTING*: A. D. 1704-1729.

A. D. 1765.—Patriotic self-denials.—Non-importation agreements. See *UNITED STATES OF AM.*: A. D. 1764-1767.

A. D. 1774.—The First Continental Congress. See *UNITED STATES OF AM.*: A. D. 1774 (SEPTEMBER, and SEPTEMBER-OCTOBER).

A. D. 1775.—Reception of the news of Lexington and Concord. See *UNITED STATES OF AM.*: A. D. 1775 (APRIL-JUNE).

PHILADELPHIA.

A. D. 1775.—The Second Continental Congress. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1775 (MAY—AUGUST).

A. D. 1777.—The British army in the city.—Removal of Congress to York. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1777 (JANUARY—DECEMBER).

A. D. 1777-1778.—The gay winter with the British in the city.—The Battle of the Kegs.—The Mischianza.—“The year 1778 found the British at Philadelphia in snug quarters, unembarrassed by the cares of the field, and, except for occasional detachments, free from other military duties than the necessary details of garrison life. The trifling affairs that occurred during the remainder of the season served rather as a zest to the pleasures which engaged them than as a serious occupation. . . . No sooner were they settled in their winter-quarters than the English set on foot scenes of gayety that were long remembered, and often with regret, by the younger part of the local gentry. . . . Of all the band, no one seems to have created such a pleasing impression or to have been so long admiringly remembered as André. His name in our own days lingered on the lips of every aged woman whose youth had seen her a belle in the royal lines. . . . The military feasts about Philadelphia, in the earlier part of 1778, were neither numerous or important. Howe aimed at little more than keeping a passage clear for the country-people, within certain bounds, to come in with marketing. The incident known as the Battle of the Kegs was celebrated by Hopkinson in a very amusing song that, wedged to the air of Maggy Lander, was long the favorite of the American military vocalists; but it hardly seems to have been noticed at Philadelphia until the whig version came in. The local newspapers say that, in January, 1778, a barrel floating down the Delaware being taken up by some boys exploded in their hands, and killed or maimed one of them. A few days after, some of the transports fired a few guns at several other kegs that appeared on the tide; but no particular notice of the occurrence was taken. These torpedoes were sent down in the hope that they would damage the shipping.” When Howe was displaced from the command and recalled, his officers, among whom he was very popular, resolved “to commemorate their esteem for him by an entertainment not less novel than splendid. This was the famous Mischianza [or Meschianza] of the 18th of May, 1778; the various nature of which is expressed by its name, while its conception is evidently taken from Lord Derby’s fête champêtre at The Oaks, June 9th, 1774, on occasion of Lord Stanley’s marriage to the Duke of Hamilton’s daughter. . . . The regatta, or aquatic procession, in the Mischianza was suggested by a like pageant on the Thames, June 23rd, 1775. . . . A mock tournament—perhaps the first in America—was a part of the play.”—W. Sargent, *Life of Major John André*, ch. 9.

ALSO IN: J. T. Scharf and T. Westcott, *Hist. of Philadelphia*, ch. 17 (v. 1).—A. H. Wharton, *Through Colonial Doorways*, ch. 2.

A. D. 1778.—Evacuation by the British. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1778 (JUNE).

A. D. 1780-1784.—Founding of the Pennsylvania Bank and the Bank of North America. See MONEY AND BANKING: A. D. 1780-1784.

PHILIPPINE ISLANDS.

A. D. 1787.—The sitting of the Federal Constitutional Convention. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1787.

A. D. 1876.—The Centennial Exhibition. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1876.

PHILADELPHIA, Tenn., Battle at. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1863 (OCTOBER—DECEMBER: TENNESSEE).

PHILADELPHIA LIBRARY COMPANY. See LIBRARIES, MODERN: UNITED STATES OF AM.

PHILIP, Roman Emperor, A. D. 244-249. . . . Philip, King of Macedon, The ascendancy in Greece of. See GREECE: B. C. 359-338, and 357-336. . . . Philip, King of the Pokanokets, and his war with the English. See NEW ENGLAND: A. D. 1674-1675, to 1676-1678. . . . Philip, King of Sweden, 1112-1118. . . . Philip (called The Bold), Duke of Burgundy, 1363-1404. . . . Philip (called The Good), Duke of Burgundy, 1418-1467. . . . Philip I, King of France, 1060-1108. . . . Philip II. (called Augustus), King of France, 1180-1223. . . . Philip II., King of the Two Sicilies, 1554-1598; Duke of Burgundy, 1555-1598; King of Spain, 1556-1598; King of Portugal, 1580-1598. . . . Philip III. (called The Bold), King of France, 1270-1285. . . . Philip III., King of Spain, Portugal and the Two Sicilies, and Duke of Burgundy, 1598-1621. . . . Philip IV. (called The Fair), King of France, 1285-1314. . . . Philip IV., King of Spain, 1621-1665; King of Portugal, 1621-1640. . . . Philip V., King of France and Navarre, 1316-1322. . . . Philip V., King of Spain (first of the Spanish-Bourbon line), 1700-1746. . . . Philip VI., King of France (the first king of the House of Valois), 1328-1350.

PHILIPHAUGH, Battle of (1645). See SCOTLAND: A. D. 1644-1645.

PHILIPPI.—Founded by Philip of Macedonia, in 356 B. C., in the district of Pangaeus.

PHILIPPINE ISLANDS.—The archipelago known as the Philippine Islands (named in honor of Philip II. of Spain), stretching between the China Sea and the Pacific Ocean, through 16 degrees of latitude and 9 of longitude, almost from Formosa to Borneo and the Moluccas, contains, according to Spanish accounts, 408 habitable islands, besides many hundreds of small and worthless rocky islets. Luzon and Mindanao, each larger than Ireland, are the most considerable in size. The land area of the whole archipelago is said to be about 114,000 square miles. The archipelago was discovered by Magellan (or Magalhaes) in 1521, and Spanish conquest and settlement was begun in 1565. Manila, the capital, on the island of Luzon, was founded in 1571. It cannot be said that the supremacy of Spain was ever made complete, especially if the Sulu group of islands, at the southern extremity of the archipelago, is considered to belong to it. The Mohammedan Sultan of Sulu appears to be a quite substantial sovereign, though the Spaniards claim tribute from him. In those islands, as throughout the archipelago, the natives are mostly of the Malayan race. Great tribal variations, however, appear. The Tagals of Luzon and the Visayans of several other islands, both Malayan in origin, are quite distinct peoples. These are the largest divisions of the Malay stock; but there are several others, besides mountaineer tribes of Negrito origin, and

PHILIPPINE ISLANDS.

a considerable immigrant population of Chinese. More extensively than in other regions of the eastern world, the natives have accepted the Christian religion. Of the mode in which the Spaniards established their rule, and in which they have exercised it, Dr Jagor, who published an account of travels in the Philippines, in 1875, has this to say. "The character of the people, as well as their political disposition, favoured the occupancy. There was no mighty power, no old dynasty, no influential priestly domination to overcome, no traditions of national pride to suppress. The natives were either heathens, or recently proselytized superficially to Islamism, and lived under numerous petty chiefs, who ruled them despotically, made war upon one another, and were easily subdued. The Spaniards limited the power of the petty chiefs, upheld slavery, and abolished hereditary nobility and dignity, substituting in its place an aristocracy created by themselves for services rendered to the state, but they carried out all these changes very gradually and cautiously. The old usages and laws, so long as they did not interfere with the natural course of government remained untouched." In its early days, Dr Jagor believed that "the Spanish rule in these islands was always a mild one, not because the laws, which treated the Indians like children, were wonderfully gentle, but because the causes did not exist which caused such scandalous cruelties in Spanish America and in the colonies of other nations. It was fortunate for the natives that their islands possessed no wealth, in the shape of precious stones or costly spices. In the earlier days of maritime traffic there was little possibility of exporting the numerous agricultural productions of the colony, and it was scarcely worth while, therefore, to make the most of the land. The few Spaniards who resided in the colony found such an easy method of making money in the commerce with China and Mexico, that they held themselves aloof from all economic enterprises.

Taking into consideration the wearisome and dangerous navigation of the time, it was, moreover, impossible for the Spaniards, upon whom their too large possessions in America already imposed an exhausting man tax, to maintain a strong armed force in the Philippines. The subjection . . . was chiefly accomplished by the assistance of the monastic orders, whose missionaries were taught to employ extreme prudence and patience. The Philippines were thus principally won by a peaceful conquest. The taxes laid upon the natives were so trifling that they did not suffice for the administration of the colony. The difference was covered by yearly contributions from Mexico. The extortions of unconscientious officials were by no means conspicuous by their absence. Cruelties, however, such as were practised in the American mining districts, or in the manufactures of Quito, never occurred in the Philippines. . . . The only tax which the Indians pay is the poll-tax, known as the 'Tributo,' which originally, 300 years ago, amounted to one dollar for every pair of adults. . . . By degrees the tax has been raised to two and one-sixteenth dollars. . . . Besides this, every man has to give forty days' labour every year to the state. . . . The little use, however, that is made of these services is shown by the fact that any one can obtain release from them for a sum which at most is not more than three dollars

PHILISTINES.

No personal service is required of women." The writer found, however, a most wicked and cruel oppression of the native peasantry being exercised, at the period of his sojourn, in the management of the monopoly of tobacco culture which the Spanish government maintains. By seizure of their fields, by compulsion of their labour, by defrauding them of payments for the product, even at prices which are pittances, arbitrarily fixed, the wretched peasants were heartlessly abused. There have been many revolts, but none "of any great danger to the Spanish rule. The discontent has always been confined to a single district, as the natives do not form a united nation; neither the bond of a common speech nor a general interest binding the different tribes together. . . . Half castes and creoles . . . are not, as they formerly were in America, excluded from all official appointments; but they feel hurt and injured through the crowds of place hunters which the frequent changes of Ministers send to Manilla." "The influence, also," wrote Dr Jagor, "of the American element, is at least visible on the horizon, and will be more noticeable when the relations increase between the two countries. At present they are very slender. In proportion as the navigation of the west coast of America extends the influence of the American element over the South Sea the captivating, magic power which the great republic exercises over the Spanish colonies will not fail to make itself felt also in the Philippines. The Americans are evidently destined to bring to a full development the germs originated by the Spaniards." All things considered, it is the opinion of this careful observer and candid writer, that "credit is certainly due to Spain for having bettered the condition of a people who, though comparatively speaking highly civilized, yet, being continually distracted by petty wars, had sunk into a disordered and uncultivated state. The inhabitants of these beautiful islands, upon the whole, may well be considered to have lived as comfortably during the last hundred years, protected from all external enemies and governed by mild laws, as those of any other tropical country under native or European sway. . . . The monks . . . have certainly had an essential part in the production of the results"—F. Jagor, *Travels in the Philippines*, ch. 4, 25, and 27.

PHILIPPI, Battles of (B. C. 42). See ROME. B C 44-42

PHILIPPI, West Va., Battle of. See UNITED STATES OF AM. A D 1861 (JUNE-JULY. WEST VIRGINIA).

PHILIPPICS OF DEMOSTHENES, The. See GREECE: B C 357-336, and 351-348.

PHILIPPOPOLIS, Capture of, by the Goths. See Goths; A D. 244-251.

PHILIPSBURG: A. D. 1644.—Taken by the French. See GERMANY: A. D. 1643-1644.

A. D. 1648.—Right of garrisoning secured to France. See GERMANY: A D. 1648.

A. D. 1676.—Taken by Imperialists. See NETHERLANDS (HOLLAND): A. D. 1674-1678.

A. D. 1679.—Given up by France. See NIMAGUEN, PEACE OF.

A. D. 1734.—Siege and reduction by the French. See FRANCE: A. D. 1733-1735.

PHILISTINES, The.—"One small nation alone, of all which dwelt on the land claimed by

Israel, permanently refused to amalgamate itself with the circumcised peoples, — namely the uncircumcised Philistines. They occupied the lots which ought to have been conquered by Dan and Simeon, and had five principal cities, Gaza, Askelon, Ashdod, Gath and Ekron, of which the three first are on the sea-coast. Ashdod and Gaza were places of great strength, capable of long resisting the efforts of Egyptian and Greek warfare. The Philistines cannot have been a populous nation, but they were far more advanced in the arts of peace and war than the Hebrews. Their position commanded the land-traffic between Egypt and Canaan, and gave them access to the sea; hence perhaps their wealth and comparatively advanced civilization. Some learned men give credit to an account in Sanchoniathon, that they came from Crete." They gave their name to Palestine. — F. W. Newman, *Hist. of the Hebrew Monarchy*, ch. 2. — "Where the Philistines came from, and what they originally were, is not clear. That they moved up the coast from Egypt is certain; that they came from Kaphtor is also certain. But it by no means follows, as some argue, that Kaphtor and Egypt are the same region. . . . It appears more safe to identify Kaphtor with Crete. "But to have traced the Philistines to Crete is not to have cleared up their origin, for early Crete was full of tribes from both east and west. . . . Take them as a whole, and the Philistines appear a Semitic people." — George Adam Smith, *Historical Geog. of the Holy Land*, ch. 9.

ALSO IN: Dean Stanley, *Lect's on the Hist. of the Jewish Church*, lect. 16. — H. Ewald, *Hist. of Israel*, bk. 2, sect. 3. — See, also, JEWS: THE CONQUEST OF CANAAN, and after.

PHILOCRATES, The Peace of. See GREECE: B. C. 357-336.

PHLIUS, Siege of.—Phlius, the chief city of the small mountain state of Phlias, in the northeastern corner of Peloponnesus, adjoining Argos and Arcadia, made an heroic effort, B. C. 380, to maintain its liberties against Sparta. Under a valiant leader, Delphion, it endured a siege which lasted more than an entire year. When forced to surrender, in the end, it was treated with terrible severity by the Spartan King, Agesilaus. — E. Curtius, *Hist. of Greece*, bk. 5, ch. 5.

PHOCÆANS, OR PHOKÆANS, The.— "The citizens of Phocæa had been the last on the coast-line of Ionia [see ASIA MINOR: THE GREEK COLONIES] to settle down to a condition of tranquillity. They had no building-ground but a rocky peninsula, where they found so little space over which to spread at their ease that this very circumstance made them a thorough people of sailors. In accordance with their local situation they had turned to the waters of the Pontus, established settlements on the Dardanelles and the Black Sea, and taken part in the trade with Egypt. Here however they were unable to hold their own by the side of the Milesians, . . . and the Phocæans accordingly saw themselves obliged to look westward and to follow the direction of Chalcidian navigation. . . . It was thus that the Ionian Phœceans came into the western sea. Being forced from the first to accustom themselves to long and distant voyages, instead of the easy summer trips of the other maritime cities, they became notably bold and heroic sailors. They began where the last left

off; they made voyages of discovery into regions avoided by others; they remained at sea even when the skies already showed signs of approaching winter and the observation of the stars became difficult. They built their ships long and slim, in order to increase their agility; their merchant vessels were at the same time men-of-war. . . . They entered those parts of the Adriatic which most abound in rocks, and circumnavigated the islands of the Tyrrhenian sea in spite of the Carthaginian guard-ships; they sought out the bays of Campania and the mouths of the Tiber and Arnum; they proceeded farther, past the Alpine ranges, along the coast as far as the mouth of the Rhodanus, and finally reached Iberia, with whose rich treasures of precious metals they had first become acquainted on the coast of Italy. . . . During the period when Ionia began to be hard pressed by the Lydians, the Phœceans, who had hitherto contented themselves with small commercial settlements, in their turn proceeded to the foundation of cities in Gaul and Iberia. The mouth of the Rhodanus [the Rhone] was of especial importance to them for the purposes of land and sea trade. . . . Massalia [modern Marseilles], from the forty-fifth Olympiad [B. C. 600] became a fixed seat of Hellenic culture in the land of the Celts, despite the hostility of the piratical tribes of Liguria and the Punic fleet. Large fisheries were established on the shore; and the stony soil in the immediate vicinity of the city itself was converted into vine and olive plantations. The roads leading inland were made level, which brought the products of the country to the mouth of the Rhone; and in the Celtic towns were set up mercantile establishments, which collected at Massalia the loads of British tin, of inestimable value for the manufacture of copper, while wine and oil, as well as works of art, particularly copper utensils, were supplied to the interior. A totally new horizon opened for Hellenic inquiry." — E. Curtius, *Hist. of Greece*, bk. 2, ch. 3. — See, also, ASIA MINOR: B. C. 724-539.

PHOCAS, Roman Emperor (Eastern), A. D. 602-610.

PHOCIANS, The. See PHOKIANS.

PHOCION, Execution of. See GREECE: B. C. 321-312.

PHOCIS: B. C. 357-346.—Seizure of Delphi.—The Ten Years Sacred War with Thebes.—Intervention of Philip of Macedon.—Heavy punishment by his hand. See GREECE: B. C. 357-336.

PHENICIANS: Origin and early history.—Commerce.—Colonists.— "The traditions of the Phenicians collected at Tyre itself by Herodotus . . . ; those of the inhabitants of Southern Arabia preserved by Strabo; and, finally, those still current in Babylon during the first centuries of the Christian era, when the Syro-Chaldee original of the book of 'Nabathœan Agriculture' was revised—all agree in stating that the Canaanites at first lived near the Cushites, their brethren in race, on the banks of the Erythrean Sea, or Persian Gulf, on that portion of the coast of Bahrein designated El Katif on our modern maps of Arabia. Pliny speaks of a land of Canaan in this neighbourhood, in his time. . . . According to Trogus Pompeius, the Canaanites were driven from their first settlements by earthquakes, and then journeyed to

wards Southern Syria. The traditions preserved in 'Nabathœan Agriculture' state, on the contrary, that they were violently expelled, in consequence of a quarrel with the Cushite monarchs of Babylon of the dynasty of Nimrod; and this is also the account given by the Arabian historians. . . . The entry of the Canaanites into Palestine, and their settlement in the entire country situated between the sea and the valley of Jordan, must . . . be placed between the period when the twelfth dynasty governed Egypt and that when the Elamite king, Chedorlaomer, reigned as suzerain over all the Tigrö-Euphrates basin. This brings us approximately between 2400 and 2300 B. C. . . . The Sidonians formed the first settlement, and always remained at the head of the Phenician nation, which, at all periods of its history, even when joined by other peoples of the same race, called itself both 'Canaanite' and 'Sidonian'. . . . The Greek name, Phenicians, of unknown origin, must not be applied to the whole of the nations of the race of Canaan who settled in Southern Syria, it belongs to the Canaanites of the sea coast only, who were always widely separated from the others. Phenicia, in both classical history and geography, is merely that very narrow tract of land, hemmed in by mountains and sea, extending from Aradus on the north to the town of Acco on the south."—F. Lenormant, *Manual of Ancient Hist. of the East*, bk. 6, ch. 1.—"Renau sums up the evidence when he says: 'The greater number of modern critics admit it as demonstrated, that the primitive abode of the Phenicians must be placed on the Lower Euphrates, in the centre of the great commercial and maritime establishments of the Persian Gulf, conformably to the unanimous witness of antiquity.' The date, the causes, and the circumstances of the migration are involved in equal obscurity. The motive for it assigned by Justin is absurd, since no nation ever undertook a long and difficult migration on account of an earthquake. If we may resort to conjecture we should be inclined to suggest that the spirit of adventure gave the first impulse, and that afterwards the unexampled facilities for trade, which the Mediterranean coast was found to possess, attracted a continuous flow of immigrants from the sea of the Rising to that of the Setting Sun"—G. Rawlinson, *The Story of Phenicia*, ch. 2.—The same, *Hist. of Phenicia*, ch. 3.—"The campaigns which the Pharaohs undertook against Syria and the land of the Euphrates after the expulsion of the Shepherds could not leave these cities [Sidon and others] unmoved. If the *Zemar* of the inscriptions of Tuthmosis III. is Zemar (Simyra) near Aradus, and Arathutu is Aradus itself, the territories of these cities were laid waste by this king in his sixth campaign (about the year 1580 B. C.); if Arkatu is Arka, south of Aradus, this place must have been destroyed in his fifteenth campaign (about the year 1570 B. C.). Sethos I. (1440-1400 B. C.) subdued the land of Limanon (i. e. the region of Lebanon), and caused cedars to be felled there. One of his inscriptions mentions Zor, i. e. Tyre, among the cities conquered by him. The son and successor of Sethos I., Ramses II., also forced his way in the first decades of the fourteenth century as far as the coasts of the Phenicians. At the mouth of the Nahr el Kelb, between Sidon and Berytus, the rocks on the coast

display the memorial which he caused to be set up in the second and third year of his reign in honour of the successes obtained in this region. In the fifth year of his reign Ramses, with the king of the Cheta, defeats the king of Arathu in the neighbourhood of Kadeshu on the Orontes, and Ramses III., about the year 1310 B. C., mentions beside the Cheta who attack Egypt the people of Arathu, by which name in the one case as in the other, may be meant the warriors of Aradus. If Arathu, like Arathutu, is Aradus, it follows, from the position which Ramses II. and III. give to the *princes* of Arathu, that beside the power to which the kingdom of the Hittites had risen about the middle of the fifteenth century B. C., and which it maintained to the end of the fourteenth, the Phenician cities had assumed an independent position. The successes of the Pharaohs in Syria come to an end in the first decades of the fourteenth century. Egypt makes peace and enters into a contract of marriage with the royal *house* of the Cheta. . . . The overthrow of the kingdom of the Hittites, which succumbed to the attack of the Amorites soon after the year 1300 B. C., must have had a reaction on the cities of the Phenicians. Expelled Hittites must have been driven to the coast-land, or have fled thither, and in the middle of the thirteenth century the successes gained by the Hebrews who broke in from the East, over the Amorites, the settlement of the Hebrews on the mountains of the Amorites [see JEWS, CONQUEST OF CANAAN], must again have thrown the vanquished, i. e. the fugitives of this nation, towards the coast. With this retirement of the older strata of the population of Canaan to the coast is connected the movement which from this period emanates from the coasts of the Phenicians, and is directed towards the islands of the Mediterranean and the *Ægean*. It is true that on this subject only the most scanty statements and traces, only the most legendary traditions have come down to us, so that we can ascertain these advances only in the most wavering outlines. One hundred miles to the west off the coast of Phenicia lies the island of Cyprus. . . . The western writers state that before the time of the Trojan war Belus had conquered and subjugated the island of Cyprus, and that Citium belonged to Belus. The victorious Belus is the Baal of the Phenicians. The date of the Trojan war is of no importance for the settlement of the Phenicians in Cyprus, for this statement is found in Virgil only. More important is the fact that the settlers brought the Babylonian cuneiform writing to Cyprus. . . . The settlement of the Sidonians in Cyprus must therefore have taken place before the time in which the alphabetic writing, i. e. the writing specially known as Phenician, was in use in Syria, and hence at the latest before 1100 B. C. . . . In the beginning of the tenth century B. C. the cities of Cyprus stood under the supremacy of the king of Tyre. The island was of extraordinary fertility. The forests furnished wood for ship-building; the mountains concealed rich veins of the metal which has obtained the name of copper from this island. Hence it was a very valuable acquisition, an essential strengthening of the power of Sidon in the older, and Tyre in the later period. . . . As early as the fifteenth century B. C., we may regard the Phenician cities as the central points of a trade branching east and